Penn State Berks Senate
Monday, April 16, 2012
1:00-2:30 PM
Multi-Purpose Room, Perkins Student Center
Agenda

- Call to Order

- Additions, Corrections, and Approval of Minutes of the March 19, 2012 meeting

- Announcements and Reports by the Chair

- Reports of Officers and University Senators
  - Vice Chair Bowers
  - Secretary and Senator Zambanini
  - Senator and Parliamentarian Aynardi
  - Senator Shibley
  - Senator Snyder
  - Student Senator Tiffany Wesner
  - SGA President Larry Wesner

- Comments and Announcements by Administrators
  - Chancellor Hillkirk
  - Associate Dean Esqueda

- Unfinished Business
• **Motions from Committees**
  - New Standing Committee: Intercollegiate Athletics, Executive Committee ([Appendix A](#))

• **Informational Reports**
  - Strategic Planning and Budget Committee, Salary Report ([Appendix B](#))
  - Physical Facilities and Safety Committee, Informational Report on the Beaver Community Center, March 30, 2012 ([Appendix C](#))
  - Physical Facilities and Safety Committee, Informational Report on the Smoking Policy, March 30, 2012 ([Appendix D](#))
  - Minutes – Student Life Committee, March 26, 2012 ([Appendix E](#))

• **Committee Reports**
  - Academic Affairs, Committee Chair Mart
  - Faculty Affairs, Committee Chair Bowers
  - Strategic Planning and Budget, Committee Chair Forrey
  - Physical Facilities and Safety, Committee Chair Amaral
  - Student Life Committee, Committee Chair Berger

• **New Legislative Business** – Senate Officers Election

• **Forensic Business**

• **Comments for the Good of the Order**

• **Adjournment**
Attendees: Ali Alikhani, Katie Amaral, Mohamad Ansari, Jennifer Arnold, David Aurentz, Martha Aynardi, David Bender, William Bowers, Nancy Dewald, Maureen Dunbar, Valetta Eshbach, Katie Garcia, Sudip Ghosh, Hassan Gourama, Zohra Guisse, Ben Infantolino, James Karlinsey, Mahsa Kazempour, Dan Litvin, Lauren Martin, Lingqi Meng, Deena Morganti, Tami Myśliwiec, Rungun Nathan, Randall Newnham, JoAnne Pumariega, Malika Richards, Toby Rider, Dave Sanford, Jessica Schocker, John Shank, Ike Shibley, Stephen Snyder, Terry Speicher, Rosario Torres, Amy White Berger, Robert Zambanini (Faculty); Marie Smith (Staff); Pradip Bandyopadhyay, Kim Berry, Paul Esqueda, Keith Hillkirk, Janelle Larson, Dennis Mays, Belen Rodriguez-Mourelo, Blaine Steensland (Administration); Tim Smith, Larry Wesner, Tiffany Wesner (Students)

1. **Call to Order**

2. **Approval of Minutes of the Preceding Meetings- Minutes of January 30, 2012– The minutes were approved.**

3. **Announcements and Reports by the Chair** – Deena Morganti introduced Katie Garcia, who is filling in for Billie Walker as Asst. Librarian, and has previously worked in Academic Advising at Florida State University.

4. **Reports of Officers and University Senators**
   - **Vice-Chair Bowers – No Report**
   - **Secretary and Senator Zambanini** – At the last Curricular Affairs Committee meeting, an issue was raised regarding the fact that minors are listed in the system using different codes. It was felt that this may create confusion among the students, and appears to be more of a programming issue within the system. This issue will be revisited and revised with a later report. Courses with a travel component will not be permitted for the spanning of semesters effective fall 2012, as per Federal Regulations.
   - **Senator and Parliamentarian Aynardi** – There has been a change with the limitations to enrollment for non-degree students. Students who are in a non-degree status will be asked to leave the University after 30 credits, not 40, and they must maintain a GPA of 2.01 or higher. It is important to note that if advising students to take a summer course, they must maintain a C or higher in order to not have their GPA drop below what is required. The report is available in this month’s Senate Docket.
   - **Senator Shibley – No Report**
   - **Senator Snyder** – The Advisory and Consultative Report regarding Fixed-Term Faculty and restoration of tenure is currently in the process of revision pending several recommendations. Current statistics show the erosion of tenure with the percentage of the non-tenure category of full-time faculty at 48.2%. The University’s goal of restored tenure is 66%. In addition to many of the recommendations being brought forth, clarification of the Faculty Salary Report will be addressed, since in its current state, it does not clearly represent what portion pertains to fixed-term faculty.
   - **Student Senator Tiffany Wesner** – Student Senator Wesner announced that she will not be seeking re-election as Student Senator and will be re-focusing her attention toward the SGA. The Chair thanked Student Senator Wesner for all of her contributions to the Senate during the past year.
• **SGA President Larry Wesner** - SGA elections are underway for University Faculty Senate and Financial Manager. Both he and the current Vice President will be seeking re-election for next year. There will be a Diversity Summit held this weekend through the CCSG. Berks represents the largest group attending with 3 groups participating in this year’s event.

5. **Comments and Announcements by Administrators**

• **Chancellor Hillkirk**
  - Chancellor Hillkirk, along with his wife and a group of 20 Berks students, traveled to Costa Rica over Spring Break and participated in a community service project at a local orphanage. The students did an outstanding job representing Penn State Berks. Both Andrea Pfaff and Kelly Meyer from Campus Life are to be commended on doing an outstanding job in putting this trip together.
  - Thon raised over $10 million and had another record-breaking year; our students are to be congratulated on their efforts in making this another successful campaign. The Alumni Chapter hosted an event at a recent Reading Royals game, where we were given the opportunity to meet with families and children from the community who have been positively affected by the monies raised by Thon.
  - Chancellor Hillkirk continues to be impressed by all of the positive things being done on campus and in the community by our students, faculty and staff. The entire focus of the next issue of the Blue & White magazine will focus on leadership awards, service awards and recognitions that our faculty and staff have achieved over the past year.
  - Enrollment numbers show an increase of 17 FTE’s for spring semester; however, the numbers for fall semester are currently trending below what they were last year at this time. The focus remains on getting our prospective students from offer status to paid-accept. In light of this focus, we have developed two new scholarship programs to encourage prospective students to attend Berks. One program is already in place and focuses on offering students a scholarship based on their GPA and SAT scores; the other is currently being rolled-out, and focuses on the non-traditional student. This scholarship would award students $2,000 should they meet the criteria of being 24 years or older and enrolling as a new student.
  - Plans for ground-breaking for the Perkins Plaza are currently underway. There are still several opportunities available for giving.
  - Chancellor Hillkirk expressed that the best recruiters to bring in new students to Penn State Berks are the faculty. It is through their research and personal connections that will ultimately want to make students want to attend and stay Penn State Berks.
  - Elections for University Faculty Senate will take place early April; Chancellor Hillkirk expressed his support for Chair Ansari’s candidacy as Chair, and feels he would do an outstanding job representing Penn State Berks.

• **Associate Dean Esqueda**
  - The Celebrating Teaching Colloquium will be held on Friday, May 4, 2012. This year’s topic is “Engaging Students in the Classroom and Beyond.” Penn State Berks is now part of the Eastern Alliance, along with Penn State’s Schuylkill, Lehigh Valley, Wilkes Barre, and Worthington Scranton locations. Chancellor Hillkirk will be starting off the program by speaking on behalf of the leadership role that Penn State Berks plays within the Alliance.
  - Commencement will be held on Saturday, May 5, 2012. A breakfast for faculty and staff will be held at 7:45 a.m. Announcements pertaining to faculty promotion and tenure, as well as, the presentation of our annual faculty awards will be announced during the breakfast.
6. **Unfinished Business – None**

7. **Motions from Committees**
   - **Legislative Report – Core Council Recommendation, Strategic Planning and Budget Committee (Appendix A)** – Committee Chair Forrey reviewed the Core Council’s recommendation, as outlined in the report. A vote was called and the motion was approved.
   - **Legislative Report – Faculty Workload Policy, Faculty Affairs Committee (Appendix B)** – Committee Chair Bowers explained how the language of the report was changed from passive to persistent. In addition, other aspects of the changes were reviewed. While under discussion, there was a motion to amend the amendment and to strike the language pertaining to the 8 credits and return it back to 2 courses. The Chair opened discussion for this amendment. Arguments in favor and in opposition were presented. The Chair relinquished his position to the Parliamentarian and presented the following views: “In light of the Core Council recommendations, which are calling for a reduction in the supplemental II compensation, Penn State Berks would be better served in so having 8 credits of compensation and simply making it 2 courses.” Arguments in favor and in opposition to the amendment were presented. A motion was made to amend the amendment language to read: “2 courses or 8 credits, whichever is less.” The Chair called for a vote on the amendment to the amendment. The motion failed. Another amendment was presented to amend the amendment language to read: “2 courses not to exceed 8 credits.” The Chair called for a vote on the amendment to the amendment. The vote was 26 in favor, 16 opposed. The motion was approved. The Chair returned to the original motion and called for a vote to ratify the original motion as presented. The vote was 23 in favor, 14 opposed. The motion was approved.
   - **Report of the Academic Affairs Committee, February, 2012 (Appendix C)** – Michelle Mart – This report is in response to the Core Council recommendation regarding under enrolled degrees. Concerns were presented pertaining to the phasing out the two-year HRIM Program, specifically pertaining to what will be done with the program’s new facilities and faculty member in the interim until the four-year program is in place. The Committee Chair’s response was the Committee’s report was primarily in reaction to the Core Council recommendation to curtailing the 2-year HRIM program. Division Head Larson made the statement that Berks will continue to offer the first 2 years of the 4-year program prior to having the 4-year program in place. Chair Ansari reiterated that this is a Legislative Report that requires the Senate’s consideration for approval and requires no second. A vote was called and the motion was approved.

8. **Informational Reports**
   - **Minutes of the Strategic Planning and Budget Committee - Minutes for February 8, 2012 (Appendix D)** – Bob Forrey
   - **Student Life Committee - Minutes for February 6, 2012 (Appendix E)** – Amy White Berger
   - **Physical Facilities and Safety Committee - Informational Report on Franco Re-Purposing, March 8, 2012 (Appendix F)** – Katie Amaral

9. **Committee Reports**
   - Academic Affairs - Michelle Mart
   - Faculty Affairs – Bill Bowers
   - Strategic Planning and Budget – Bob Forrey
   - Physical Facilities and Safety – Katie Amaral
   - Student Life – Amy Berger
10. New Legislative Business - None

11. Forensic Business - None

12. Comments for the Good of the Order – None

13. Adjournment
Appendix A

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

Establishment of a New Standing Committee

Intercollegiate Athletics

Approved by the Senate Executive Committee

April 2, 2012

Rationale:

In recent years the University-wide Intercollegiate Athletics Committee (IAC) has grown to an unwieldy size with the addition of five Division 3 NCAA campus athletic programs (with individual FAR representatives) that has resulted in loss of adequate representation for each D3 campus in the larger IAC. A recent proposal by the University Faculty Senate Committee on Committees and Rules has called a reduction in the size of this Committee, but also encouragement for each Division 3 campus to enhance the local governance of athletics on its campus by creation of a localized IAC, and for the five Division 3 campuses to form their own committee to undertake the duties listed under the University Faculty Senate bylaws. In addition, since the NCAA treats each Division 3 campus as a separate entity with the responsibility of governing its own campus athletic program and solely responsible to the NCAA for any violations of NCAA rules, it seems appropriate at this time to establish a committee to carry out these duties at the campus level and through Berks Faculty Senate jurisdiction. Given the past dominance of the Division 1 University Athletics program at IAC meetings, the creation of a local IAC committee at Berks at this time enables the campus to more adequately and efficiently supervise and regulate athletics by more closely following the Division 3 NCAA model.
**Duties:**

The Committee on Intercollegiate Athletics is responsible to the Senate for all intercollegiate athletic programs at the University as they relate to the University’s academic and educational objectives. Intercollegiate athletics shall include all teams and individuals representing the University with significant off-University activity.

The committee shall consider policies on eligibility of students for intercollegiate athletics; approve intercollegiate athletic schedules as they affect academic standards and distribute this approval to the University-wide Intercollegiate Athletics Committee; and help promote a sound academic climate for the intercollegiate athletic programs at Berks campus.

The Committee shall meet with responsible administrators and others concerning the intercollegiate athletic programs at Penn State Berks that offer intercollegiate competition. It shall make a particular effort to seek the views of students participating in these intercollegiate athletic programs.

The committee serves also as an advisory committee to the Chancellor of the Berks campus on the operation of the intercollegiate programs. Subject to the general authority of the Chancellor of Berks, it shall initiate new policies, or review existing policies, which govern these intercollegiate athletic programs. While these policies shall guide the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics and administrators at Berks, the Committee shall not act in an administrative or executive capacity. It shall develop recommendations to the Chancellor of the Berks campus on matters affecting the North Eastern Athletic Conference (NEAC), the other Penn State Division 3 campus athletic programs, the University-wide Intercollegiate Athletic Committee, the NCAA, and other national athletic governance bodies in which the University holds membership and shall work closely with the faculty representatives in establishing the University’s formal vote to these organizations. At the request of the Chancellor of the Berks campus the committee may consider other issues affecting the various athletic programs under the Chancellor’s jurisdiction.

The Committee shall report on its activities to the Berks Senate at least annually.
Membership:

(i) Two faculty members from each Division shall be appointed by the Berks Executive Committee for a period of two years (with one faculty member serving as the Committee Chair);

(ii) One undergraduate student senator from the Berks USGA;

(iii) Faculty Athletics Representative to the National Collegiate Athletic Association;

(iv) Director of Intercollegiate Athletics at Berks;

(vi) Senior Women's Administrator for Intercollegiate Athletics (if the AD is not female);

(vii) Two student-athletes (one male and one female) on Berks varsity athletics teams (who are also members of the Student-Athlete Academic Committee);

(viii) Director of Student Life at the Berks campus;

(ix) Coach of one of the Berks varsity athletic teams.
The Strategic Planning and Budget Committee discussed the salary disparities that were identified in previous comparisons between Penn State Berks and other Penn State campuses. It was noted that mid-year salary adjustments were made to help correct the salary disparities. The effect of these adjustments was not included in the 2011-2012 Report on Faculty Salaries that was provided to the committee by the University Senate Committee on Faculty Benefits. It is recommended that updated data be reviewed when it becomes available in order to determine whether the Berks campus is in-line with other non-UP campuses.
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS

2011–2012 Report on Faculty Salaries

(Informational)

Introduction

The Report on Faculty Salaries is an informational report of the Committee on Faculty Benefits offering an analysis of faculty salaries at Penn State. The report is accompanied by a set of tables provided by the Office of the Executive Vice President and Provost with technical assistance from the Office of Planning and Institutional Assessment (OPIA) and the College of Medicine. This report highlights several observations that may be of interest to the general audience of the University Faculty Senate. More detail is available in the supporting tables including comparisons with other institutions and comparisons among the colleges and campuses within Penn State. The supporting tables are available at http://www.senate.psu.edu/agenda/2011-2012/mar2012/salarytables.pdf.

There are many factors that may contribute to differences in salary statistics making it difficult to draw inferences from these data. Market forces, non-monetary compensation and benefits, and cost of living differences are often not reflected in the data. Comparisons across institutions or across units within institutions can be complicated by unequal distributions in key dimensions such as discipline, rank, length of time in rank, and length of employment. The data presented here may be limited and may not provide sufficient detail for drawing inferences about important issues pertaining to faculty compensation such as gender or racial inequities. However, these data may be useful for informing discussion and prompting further inquiry. The Committee on Faculty Benefits encourages the members of the faculty at Penn State to use these data as a reference.

Comparisons to Other Institutions

Salaries within Penn State’s University Park–based colleges seem to be at or slightly higher than comparable salaries among institutions participating in the Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE). The ratio of Penn State salaries to AAUDE salaries ranges from a maximum of 1.19 for professors in the College of Information Sciences and Technology to a minimum of 0.94 for assistant professors in the College of Communications and professors in the College of Education (Table 1). Penn State’s salaries seem to have increased slightly more from 2009–2010 to 2010–2011 than comparable AAUDE salaries. This is apparent in Table 3 where many of the salaries for AAUDE institutions showed a decrease from the previous year while more than half of the Penn State salaries showed an increase of 3% or more over the previous year.

While salaries at the college-level have increased compared to salaries in the AAUDE, the average salaries at Penn State University Park have not changed significantly relative to peers in the AAUDE or the Big Ten. Penn State’s average salaries for professors and associate professors at University Park for the 2010–2011 fiscal year continue to rank around the 75th percentile among peers in the AAUDE and among the top compared to other institutions in the Big Ten (Table 4). Assistant professors at Penn State University Park have moved up in the rankings from 14th to 10th among peers in the AAUDE and from 7th to 5th among the Big Ten.
Salaries in Penn State’s campus-based colleges seem to rank in the middle among campuses at other Big Ten institutions (Table 7). When compared with campuses of the same type, salaries at Penn State’s campus-based colleges appear to be higher than campuses at other Big Ten institutions. These differences may reflect regional differences as Penn State’s salaries appear to be comparable to other universities in Pennsylvania (Table 8) including the other state-related and state-owned universities. The average salaries at several of Penn State’s campus-based colleges are near or below the State System of Higher Education (SSHE) (Table 8).

Salaries for Penn State’s librarian faculty rank among the top compared to their peers at other public institutions in the Big Ten (Table 9). The average salary for Penn State associate librarians ranks highest among the public institutions in the Big Ten. The average salaries for Penn State librarians and assistant librarians each rank third among the Big Ten public institutions.

Comparisons within Penn State

Among Penn State University Park–based colleges, the faculty in the Smeal College of Business appear to have the highest salaries followed by the faculty in the College of Information Sciences and Technology. The colleges of Arts & Architecture, Communications, and Education appear to be the lowest salaries among the Penn State University Park–based colleges. Of all the units with faculty, the University Libraries seem to have the lowest salaries (Table 11).

The variation in salary seems to increase with each higher rank (Table 10; Table 11). The interquartile range (IQR)—the difference between the 75th and 25th percentiles—is typically greatest for professors. For instance, the IQR for standing appointment professors at Penn State University Park is $44,869. The IQR for standing appointment assistant professors at Penn State University Park is $14,387. The mean years in rank also increases with each higher rank, which may account for some of the variation in salary.

Tables 12 and 13 provide the salary quartiles by gender. At the highest levels of aggregation found in Table 12, the salaries for females appear to be lower than those of males. These results should be interpreted with caution, however, as the male faculty members typically have higher mean years in rank and the level of aggregation does not take into consideration disproportionate representation among colleges and departments.

Table 13 provides the salary quartiles by gender at the college-level. At this level, the difference in salaries between females and males seems to diminish. Where differences do exist, the higher salary range often coincides with higher mean years in rank. Further differentiation by department and/or academic discipline may explain some of the remaining differences. However, the data become sparser with each additional dimension. Already at the college level there are data elements that must be suppressed due to a low number of individuals. Further differentiation would only increase the amount of data that must be suppressed.

Description of the Supporting Tables

The complete set of data accompanying this report consists of 15 tables. These tables may be considered in two major portions: the interinstitutional comparisons presented in Tables 1–9 and the intrainstitutional comparisons presented in Tables 10–15. The interinstitutional comparisons...
in Tables 1–9 may be further divided according to the source of the data: the Association of American Universities Data Exchange, the American Association of University Professors, and the Association of Research Libraries.

**Definition of salary** The salaries presented in the supporting tables reflect contract salary. These salary figures do not include additional monies an individual may receive such as summer teaching, administrative stipends, or supplemental monies for extra assignments. The salary data also do not include fringe benefits such as the University’s contribution to the individual’s retirement plan, health insurance, or tuition discounts.

The salary data are defined on the basis of a 9-month (36-week) appointment. Unless otherwise noted, salaries for faculty members on 12-month (48-week) appointments are converted to a 9-month equivalent using a standard conversion factor of 0.818.

**Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) Tables** The Association of American Universities Data Exchange (AAUDE) is an organization composed of Association of American Universities (AAU) institutions that contribute their institutional data to the data exchange. The AAU describes itself as “an association of 61 leading public and private research universities in the United States and Canada.” A recent listing of AAU member institutions is presented in Table 5. While all AAU institutions are eligible to participate in the data exchange, typically between 50 and 60 percent of the member institutions will submit data to the AAUDE in any given year. The data available in the AAUDE are for an institution’s “main campus” only.

The AAUDE comparisons allow Penn State to benchmark our faculty salaries with other leading research institutions. Direct comparison to other institutions is not available as the confidentiality rules governing participation in the AAUDE prohibit individually identifying institutional data. However, the data may be useful for indicating Penn State’s relative position among the group of AAUDE institutions. Tables 1–3 present comparisons with averages based on all institutions reporting to the AAUDE in the given year. Table 4 uses the AAUDE data to present Penn State’s ranking among a select group of 22 public institutions in the AAUDE and among the other public institutions of the Big Ten.

College-level comparisons are possible using the AAUDE data because of Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP) code data available in the AAUDE data set. The CIP codes are a taxonomic scheme developed by the U.S. Department of Education’s National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) to support tracking and reporting of fields of study and program completions activity. The college-level comparisons in Tables 1–3 compare each of Penn State’s colleges with a composite of equivalent CIP codes from other AAUDE institutions.

**American Association of University Professors (AAUP) Tables** The American Association of University Professors (AAUP) conducts an annual survey of faculty compensation, the Faculty Compensation Survey (FCS). The results of the FCS are published in March–April issue of the

1 For more information on CIP codes see [http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/](http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/cipcode/).
AAUP magazine, Academe as part of their Annual Report on the Economic Status of the Profession. The data from the FCS are used as the source for Tables 6–8. The availability of the FCS data permits direct interinstitutional comparisons. Table 6 presents Penn State’s average salaries ranked among the average salaries for the other institutions in the Big Ten.

While Table 6 only includes the “main campuses” for each institution, Table 7 and Table 8 present Penn State’s average salaries for University Park as well as for each of the campus-based colleges. Table 7 presents the average salaries at Penn State University Park and at each of the campus-based colleges ranked among the average salaries for other institutions in the Big Ten with satellite campuses. Table 8 focuses on more regional comparisons presenting the average salaries for Penn State University Park and each of the campus-based colleges in comparison to other institutions in Pennsylvania including a composite of the Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education (SSHE) institutions.

Association of Research Libraries (ARL) Tables The Association of Research Libraries (ARL) is an organization of 126 research libraries in the United States and Canada. Through membership in the ARL, Penn State shares salary-related data for our librarian faculty. Table 9 presents Penn State’s librarian salaries in comparison to other institutions in the Big Ten. The ARL data are also aggregated with the AAUP data in Table 6, which also compares Penn State’s salaries with other institutions in the Big Ten.

Internal Data Tables The intrainsitutional comparisons are based on Penn State’s internal data sources. Tables 10–14 are based on a snapshot of the human resource database taken at the end of September 2011. These snapshot data are used for the University’s official reporting activities. These data include all individuals classified as “academic” with a full-time appointment type—standing, fixed-term 1, or fixed-term multi-year. Table 15 is provided by the Hershey Medical Center to provide information on average salaries for faculty at the Medical Center.

Tables 10–13 present salary quartiles and mean years in rank along a few key dimensions. Table 10 and Table 11 each present these data by rank within appointment type category—standing or fixed-term. Table 10 aggregates the data according to campus category while Table 11 aggregates the data by college or unit for the faculty at Penn State University Park. Tables 12 and 13 expand the presentation in Tables 10 and 11 presenting the data by gender within rank and appointment type category. Table 12 aggregates the data according to campus category. Table 13 presents the quartiles aggregated by college or unit for the faculty at Penn State University Park.

The salary quartiles for the campus-based colleges are presented in Table 14. Again the data are presented by rank within appointment type category. The data are aggregated by college and by division or department within the college.

Limitations of the Data

The supporting tables accompanying this report offer a number of different perspectives on faculty salaries. The data presented in the supporting tables are an attempt to provide as objective an analysis as possible. However, readers are cautioned to consider the limitations of these data before drawing any conclusions based on the data presented here.
Direct comparisons with other institutions can be difficult as organizations differ in structure. Often there are unequal proportions among one or more key factors such as rank, academic discipline, age, and years of experience. The use of the average as the reported statistic further complicates the comparison. The average is one statistic that is susceptible to the influence of extreme values in the population.

Comparisons based on internal data may seem to be an opportunity to exercise more control over the chosen statistic. Many of the supporting tables accompanying this report present salary quartiles, which are much less likely to be influenced by extreme values. But interpreting differences between percentiles can be more difficult than differences based on the average. Unequal proportions among the groupings within the organization could create paradoxical situations where conclusions based on data at one level of aggregation may not be supported at a finer level of detail.

The data presented in the supporting tables reflect the entire population. Therefore, any differences between groupings are actual differences and the statistical significance of the difference is not an issue. Before drawing any conclusions from those differences, readers are reminded that there are many factors that affect an individual’s salary. The data presented in the supporting tables reflect a few factors that seem most relevant to the interests of the Faculty Senate. Properly controlling for the number of factors known to affect an individual’s salary would require an analysis beyond the scope of this report. There are also factors such as market forces, non-monetary compensation and benefits, lifestyle choices, professional reputation, and individual personality that are not reflected in the data.

Conclusion

The data available in the tables accompanying this report present a number of perspectives on faculty salaries at Penn State. Despite these many perspectives, these data reflect a limited view of faculty compensation. While it can be difficult to draw inferences from these limited data, the Committee on Faculty Benefits hopes that these data can be useful in enabling Penn State’s faculty members to be better informed about their salary relative to their colleagues both within Penn State and at some of Penn State’s peer institutions.

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FACULTY BENEFITS
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APPENDIX C
Physical Facilities and Safety Committee
Informational Report on the Beaver Community Center
March 30, 2012

Introduction: The Physical Facilities and Safety Committee was charged to draft an informational report pertaining to the renovation of the Beaver Community Center.

The Beaver Community Center is a 28,000 sq. ft. building that was constructed in 1979. At the time of construction there was no Kinesiology Degree at Penn State Berks nor did the campus compete in NCAA Division III athletics. Currently, the Kinesiology Degree is one of the highest enrolled programs on campus and there are twelve varsity athletic programs that compete in NCAA Division III athletics.

BCC Projects 2001-2012
The following table lists the ongoing/completed maintenance projects to the Beaver Community center since 2001.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Shower/Store Room Renovation</td>
<td>$50,000 (estimate)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Install Power Door Openers</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Install Water Softener</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Bleacher, Cage, Shot Clock Upgrades</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Fitness, Kinetic Studio, Research Lab</td>
<td>$238,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Install How Water Boiler</td>
<td>$305,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>New Heating System</td>
<td>$531,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Repair Steps and Ramp</td>
<td>$17,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Paint Exterior (repair stucco)</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Repair and Resurface Gym Floor</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Replace gym Lighting</td>
<td>$11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Paint gym Walls, Ceiling, Ducts, etc.</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Replace Roof</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Weight Room HVAC Upgrade</td>
<td>$65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Upgrade Electric Service</td>
<td>$136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,826,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Plans for BCC
In 2007, a feasibility study was performed to determine the cost of adding a 13,000 sq. ft. addition to the Beaver Community Center. At the time the cost for the expansion was estimated at $6.2 million. Assuming a standard rate of inflation, the current costs for the expansion are estimated to be $8.8 million. There are ongoing efforts to identify donors to provide funds for the expansion of the Beaver Community Center.
The specific needs associated with this expansion are:

1. **Additional locker room space.** Currently there are only two locker rooms in BCC. If there are men’s and women’s competitions occurring at the same time, opposing teams are forced to share locker room space. Four additional locker rooms are needed; four that can accommodate 25 players, and two that can accommodate 15 players. If only four locker rooms are included, an additional room that can accommodate four game officials will be needed.

2. **Faculty office space.** Currently 9 full time faculty/staff share three offices. There is a need for 8 offices (100 sq. ft. each) and a reception area to accommodate a staff assistant. The existing three offices would be used for coaches and part time faculty.

3. **Classrooms.** Three-30 student classrooms are needed. These classrooms should be specifically designed for kinesiology classes.

4. **Conference Room.** A small conference room that can seat 12-15 people.

5. **Fitness Center.** A reasonable fitness center that can be used by both athletes and regular student/faculty/staff.

6. **Research space.** 1,000 sq. ft. of space dedicated to faculty/student research.

7. **Athletic Training Center.** This center should provide an area for athletic trainers to work with student athletes and needs to include examination/treatment tables and other training equipment.

8. **Laundry room.** A room sufficient to hold a washer dryer and provide short term storage of uniforms.

9. **Storage space.** 2000 sq. ft. of storage space is needed in the building.

**Committee Members:** Katie Amaral (Chair); Terry Baker; Kim Berry; Mark Dawson; Maureen Dunbar; Sadan Kulturel-Konak; Jayne Leh; Ada Leung; Kay Livingston (student representative)
APPENDIX D
Physical Facilities and Safety Committee
Informational Report on the Smoking Policy
March 30, 2012

Introduction: The Physical Facilities and Safety Committee was charged to draft an informational report pertaining to the Smoking Policy in effect on the Berks Campus. The committee notes that there is a formal University-wide policy on smoking as well as campus-specific policies in effect at Penn State.

Review of Policy AD32: The University policy on smoking is AD32 Smoking Policy and Guideline. It states, in part:

“Smoking of any material is prohibited in all University facilities, at all locations, including University-owned vehicles. It also is prohibited in any outside area adjacent to a facility whose configuration and/or other physical circumstances allow smoke either to enter and affect the internal environment or to unduly affect the environment of those entering or exiting the facility. Exemptions to this policy may be made by the Smoking Policy Review Committee if the committee deems granting the exemption to be reasonable for business or research reasons as submitted by the unit that requests the exemption.”

The enforcement of the smoking policy is also addressed in AD32:

“The success of this policy depends upon obtaining and maintaining the willingness, understanding and cooperation of all smokers and non-smokers in all University facilities. It is the responsibility of all members of the Penn State community to observe this smoking policy. Each University member is responsible for monitoring compliance with this policy at his/her level of involvement in the University community.

Policy AD32 further breaks down enforcement by area, with specific categories entitled “Office/Administrative/General Work Areas”, “Openly Assigned - Classrooms, Laboratories, and Seminar/Meeting Rooms”, and “Visitors”.

It is important to note that Policy AD32 is a policy that affects only Penn State University and it is not a law of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. As such, our campus police force is not responsible for enforcement of this policy. Any enforcement of this policy must be in compliance with policy AD32 and not rely on our campus police force.

It is also important to note that Policy AD32 specifically excludes residence halls, which are governed by Housing and Food Services and Residence Life. Any local changes to policy AD32 will not affect the residence halls on campus.

Violations of policy AD32 are covered in each of the enforcement areas outlined above, with the general language stating that the leader or designee for each area will be responsible “to determine if corrective...”
or disciplinary action needs to be taken”. The type of corrective or disciplinary action is not addressed in policy AD32.

**Berks Practices:** At Berks, building entrances are posted with “no smoking” signs and receptacles for cigarettes are provided on pathways leading to entrances. Smoking is permitted in outdoor areas not immediately adjacent to entrances. Beginning with the week of April 2nd, Maintenance and Operations, under the guidance of Kim Berry and Mark Dawson, will begin moving the receptacles for cigarettes further from the entrances to buildings and will be posting “no smoking beyond this point” signs on each receptacle.

We are currently attempting to obtain LEED certification for the Gaige Building. To obtain this certification, there can be no smoking within 25 feet of any operable door, vent or window in the Gaige Building. This would only affect the Gaige Building, and would not be applicable to Franco, Luerssen, Perkins Student Center, or any other building on campus.

Enforcement of the no-smoking zone around buildings and doors at Penn State Berks appears to be lax. Generally, members of our community appear to be unwilling to be the person that asks smokers to move away from the entrances. When asked to move, smokers on campus generally do so until inclement weather, when they move closer to the buildings to be out of the wind/rain/cold, etc.

**Other Penn State Campuses:** Some campuses have more restrictive practices than that outlined in policy AD32:

- Hershey Medical Center is smoke-free.
- Lehigh Valley banned smoking on campus beginning March 2010 (non-residential campus).
- York banned smoking on campus beginning August 2010 (non-residential campus).
- Harrisburg has excluded smoking in the main part of campus but allows smoking in the periphery, which includes campus housing and all parking lots.
- Schuylkill demarks smoke free zones around buildings with pavement marking and signs.
- Altoona, Abington and Shenango have each designated 3 smoking areas with shelters.
- Wilkes-Barre is smoke free except for designated areas. However, Wilkes-Barre allows Technical Services Employees to smoke anywhere on campus not specifically prohibited in policy AD32.
- New Kensington allows smoking only in designated areas.

**Conclusions:** Although Policy AD32 clearly outlines a smoking policy that does not allow for smoking near building entrances or other areas where smoke might enter a building, there is no easy way to enforce this policy. Individual members of the community are generally reluctant to monitor compliance with Policy AD32. The Penn State campuses that have completely banned smoking are non-residential, and as a residential campus this would not be a viable route for Berks. Most of the campuses that allow smoking only in designated areas have weather shelters for the smokers.

The smoking policy is a contentious issue and there is no consensus in regards to smoking amongst the constituencies on campus.

**Committee Members:** Katie Amaral (Chair); Terry Baker; Kim Berry; Mark Dawson; Maureen Dunbar; Sadan Kulturel-Konak; Jayne Leh; Ada Leung; Kay Livingston (student representative)
APPENDIX E

Minutes – Student Life Committee
3.26.12

Present: David Aurentz, Amy White Berger (Chair), Rungun Nathan, Blaine Steensland, Bill Sutherland

The committee’s full agenda began with the recognition of our new student member, Tom Smith. We hope to see him at our next meeting when we also hope to hear about student concerns from his point of view.

The first task for this meeting was to examine our five charges to see where we are in terms of writing the year-end report. The first charge regards an informational report from the committee that reviews the status of the Academic Recovery program based on 2010-11 data. We will ask Pete Coleman, who addressed the committee early in the year, for a brief report to attach to our end-of-year report.

Our second charge is an informational report on the campus facilities that support the out-of-class/co-curricular experiences of our students. Dave Aurentz has been conferring with Katie Amaral, Chair-Physical Facilities and Safety Committee about this. Dave will develop a short list of areas that may include, but will not be limited to, the upcoming Perkins Plaza, the Freyberger Gallery, computer and other labs, and more.

The third charge – pertaining to the enhancement of the faculty/staff involvement in the out-of-class experiences of the students – has been largely handled by Blaine, particularly through his break down of the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Blaine distributed the questionnaire that was responded to by first year and senior students and the report of the results, including comparisons of Berks College with the Penn State System and two other groups. A review of these data will further inform some of the questions raised by our list of five charges. Blaine further noted that first year acceptances will be based on the SAT writing test rather that the FTCAP tests, as in the past.

Our fourth charge – concerning how students’ in-class and out-of-class experiences ensure their best possible educational experience – has been challenging us until now. The committee arrived at the beginning of a list of existing items as well as a partial list of recommendations. The new Gaige building provides a number of positive opportunities, beginning with the beginnings of a student union area on the first floor surrounding the café. It was mentioned that students are beginning to reserve rooms set aside in Gaige for student meeting areas and that the Gaige TV offers the Bloomberg network. However, Gaige is missing a large amphitheater-type room, such as Luerssen 5, to host large-group presentations or large meetings. With regard to
virtually all of the buildings on campus, there is an imperative need for space dedicated to student use. It was noted that the former multi-person office near the department head offices and the copier in Luerssen is now a student study and meeting room (unless it has been commandeered for some other purpose by faculty). Therefore, the committee is recommending student-dedicated space in convenient locations on campus.

The fifth charge – an informational report identifying support services that Berks Campus offers to its diverse range of students – has been put together by Holly. All committee members are asked to either submit reports on what they have been working on or to comment on the charges so that the charges can be updated and reports completed for the end-of-the-year report.

We had time for a brief discussion to get a consensus about the student transportation issue. The committee would like discuss with the Executive Committee the possibility of making this issue a legislative recommendation. In short, students who rely on public transportation (BARTA) must leave campus on the last bus, at about 5:30, thereby missing the opportunity to take late-afternoon and evening classes or take part in cultural or other evening events. Because it is dangerous to walk from campus over to the Target shopping center to catch later buses, the committee proposes some sort of college-sponsored shuttle service or further discussion with BARTA about (incentivized) additional, later bus runs.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:30.
Respectfully submitted,
AWB