

Faculty Senate Clarion University

The Faculty Senate met on Monday, October 12, 2015 in Room 146 Gemmell. J. Croskey chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: J. Aaron, Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, D. Clark, R. Frakes, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, H. Luthin, J. May, C. McAleer, L. Occhipinti. J. O'Donnell, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, E. Sauvage-Callaghan, J. Smrekar, B. Sweet, L. Taylor, J. Touster and P. Woodburne. B. Hill, E. Green, P. Gent, and K. Whitney were also present.

I. Call to order – J. Croskey called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

R. Frakes moved and C. McAleer seconded a motion to approve the minutes from September 28, 2015. The minutes were approved.

III. Announcements

- E. Schutz will be running a program on October 20 called “Reconnect,” for first year students to reestablish connection. It will be set up like orientation with stations and workshops. A flyer will be coming out.
- The 10th annual GIS conference is October 15-16 this week. Events are free for all Clarion employees and students.

IV. President's report – K. Whitney

- J. Croskey, K. Whitney, and R. Nowaczyk will meet with Student Senate to discuss changes to general education. The General Education Council sent out an updated version of the proposal on Thursday or Friday. K. Whitney will be having discussions with students, faculty, and staff in October and November, open forums, then a concluding meeting with the Council on General Education, which will come up with a revision to the proposed changes by the end of this semester, with a target date of approving changes by May 1 for implementation in the fall of 2017.

J. O' Donnell asked if changes would be implemented for the class entering in the fall of 2017. K. Whitney said that is the goal, which gives time for a transition. She said that the general education needs to be updated, which was noted by Middle States in the last review.

R. Frakes asked for clarification that changes are still open to a discussion, not completed or guaranteed to pass. K. Whitney said yes, that changes will depend on discussions, but that the curriculum needs to be updated, and she hopes that general education can be a distinctive marketing tool. J. Phillips said that any proposed changes will have to be approved by Senate. K. Whitney said that typically senates do support and discuss proposals, and she hopes for a robust discussion, which will produce a good document.

J. O' Donnell asked about the timeframe in the proposal. P. Woodburne said the dates will be adjusted. K. Whitney said the dates indicate how long each stage will take, and the start date can be adjusted

J. Touster asked to what extent the process will allow the proposed changes to grow and change. He expressed a concern that the current proposal allows students to avoid science

courses. He said that while there is a pragmatic aspect of marketing the program, the ideal goal is educating students, and that the process needs to focus on the education component, not marketing. K. Whitney said that this is the kind of dialog she wants to have with departments. She said that the Council on General Education has held a number of meetings, some of which were not well attended. There was further discussion. R. Leary said he is concerned that the Council has not listened to feedback from the meetings last fall. K. Whitney said she is looking forward to meeting with departments to have this discussion and wants a collaborative process, so that comments are listened to and integrated back into the document.

S. Prezzano asked about K. Whitney's description of the proposed changes as creating a "modern" general education curriculum. K. Whitney said that the current curriculum is 22 years old, and needs to be updated to incorporate current thoughts and practices, such as inquiry seminars. She said that making it "modern" would include current best thoughts on what composes a foundational curriculum, which may include adopting current language or may be more structural, in addition to incorporating changes in the mission and vision of the institution. Accreditors want a process that takes a thorough look at the curriculum. J. Phillips said that an argument that we have to change just because it hasn't been changed doesn't work. There was further discussion.

- The football team is 6-0.
- L. Occhipinti asked if there has been any movement at the state level on the budget stalemate. K. Whitney said that there has not. R. Leary said that some students are having issues because their financial aid is held up. K. Whitney said that the university is deferring billing for these students. There was a brief discussion.

V. Student Senate Report – E. Green

Five student Senators attended a student government conference, and came back with some good ideas about possible events to increase the engagement of students with student government. Upcoming events include Wingo and the social equity dinner in November. Two committee chairs have stepped down and been replaced. The student Senate is looking forward to having a meeting about general education.

VI. Committee reports

A. CCPS – B. Sweet – The deadline for objections is 10/16. The committee will meet that day to review proposals; departments will be contacted if there are questions. The open hearings will be 10/28 at 2:30 p.m. On 10/9, there was an update to the general education proposal, which is now on the website, along with the previous version. An email was sent out to notify the campus of this.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore – Committee membership has been finalized, and the committee and subcommittee will be meeting soon.

C. CCR – J. Phillips – CCR had a request from S. Puleio regarding the UTAC committee, which is being restructured to have one position from each college. CCR is looking for volunteers.

D. Academic Standards – D. Clark – No report

E. Budget – J. Touster – The committee will be meeting soon.

F. Faculty Affairs – L. Taylor – The mentor dinners are continuing. The committee will be meeting soon.

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts – The next meeting of the Facilities Planning committee was cancelled. A. Roberts received a question about whether campus buses run late enough to accommodate attendance at the new theater. There was a discussion. K. Whitney recommended referring the issue to CSA, which runs both services. E. Sauvage-Callaghan will follow up on it.

H. Venango – J. May – The committee will be meeting soon.

VII. Old Business

a. Constitution and bylaws – B. Sweet said that changes to the CCPS procedure manual were discussed at meet & discuss, and it was forwarded to E. MacDaniel and T. Fogarty. The only change at this time is the role of the General Education Council, which will be organized as a committee charged with assessing general education. The proposal should be sent to state meet & discuss once it is signed locally.

b. Academic Standing Policy and AIPs – The university is still working based on the current policy. The Policy committee discussed IUP's policy as alternative model and drafted something that might work for us. Senators were provided this draft, which was also sent to the provost.

S. Prezzano asked if AIPs are now required for all students with a GPA below 2.0. J. Croskey said yes. S. Prezzano said that there are still some communication problems, since advisors and students are not aware of this. There was a discussion. P. Gent said that every student who was impacted was emailed, and Academic Affairs is doing follow up phone calls to students who haven't responded.

J. Croskey said that any suggestions on the suggested draft can be sent to him. S. Boyden said that the Academic Standards committee is not mentioned in the policy, and asked if the approach is more quantitative approach. A. Roberts said that D. Clark researched this, and found that very few schools have a committee as part of the process.

c. CEQ Report Webinar – The provost asked about this, but the Policy committee was not highly interested. CEQ is a group out of Columbia University that is trying to establish an alternative to the US News and World Report ranking system.

VIII. New Business

a. Foundations of Excellence - P. Gent – P. Gent thanked the many people who participated in the year long study of first year students. The project showed that while there are a lot of good things in place for first year students, there is a lack of consistency across campus and across the student body. The committee developed an action plan with

eight major recommendations, a philosophy, and outcomes, which was distributed to senators. The program wants to involve both Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. J. Phillips asked about the recommendation that some topics be integrated into first year courses. P. Gent said that this is not only inquiry seminars, but could also be other courses that have a lot of first year students, like English. There was a discussion. J. O'Donnell noted that HPE 111 is also a course that most students take. R. Frakes asked about the role of flex advisors. P. Gent said that these will be called success coaches, and are being modeled after the TRIO coaches. They will not be advising, but providing other assistance and encouragement to students, as needed, and will aim at helping students to develop independent skills. They will be SCUPA employees. H. Luthin asked how many there will be. P. Gent said that the current advertising is for three. H. Luthin asked about how peer mentors would be compensated. P. Gent said they would be paid positions. There was a brief discussion. S. Prezzano asked about the co-curricular transcript. P. Gent said that this is being developed by Student Affairs. S. Prezzano asked if it could include student research. P. Gent said it could. J. Croskey said that it will be tied into the CU Connect software. A. Roberts asked if SOAR will be the centralized office. P. Gent said they are still looking at that, and want to encourage faculty involvement. She invited faculty to volunteer to serve on the first year advisory board. D. Lott asked if E. Aubele is the contact person on Venango campus. P. Gent said yes, and that she would welcome other Venango campus faculty as well.

b. CCPS – Read ins

c. CCPS - PH/BIOL 376 proposal –This course was submitted last spring and was approved by CCPS and Senate as a 3 credit course. R. Nowaczyk sent it back in the summer asking for the number of credits to be changed to four. This could have been done as a minor change, but R. Nowaczyk requested that it go back through the process. CCPS recommended accelerating the proposal because the department wants to teach it in the spring. The proposal has been recommended by CCPS.

A motion came from the CCPS committee to consider the proposal out of sequence. The motion passed

A motion came from the CCPS committee to approve the course.

J. Smrekar asked about pay. A. Roberts said that the course will be 4 credits and 5 contact hours. The number of contact hours was not changed from the spring proposal.

S. Boyden said that the norm for a science lab is three contact hours per credit. The course was originally a normal 3 hour lab, with a 2 hour lecture. It was deemed too expensive, but that is what all other upper level labs are. She said that the idea that faculty can be flexible about whether time is spent in lab or lecture is an attempt to get around the CBA, by calling lab hours lecture hours to be able to charge students more. She said that while faculty want the class, this is a slippery slope if it becomes the model for labs. A. Roberts said that the problem is more about subverting the Carnegie unit than the CBA, since faculty are getting paid appropriately. B. Sweet said that there was a discussion of offering the course as a 2 hour lab for one credit, but this did not agree with

the Carnegie standard. D. Lott noted that A&P has a 2 hour lab for one credit. C. McAleer said that Senate can't make that change to the proposal, and noted that under CBA, one hour of lab is one workload hour. There was a lengthy discussion. A. Roberts said that this class is attached to large grants for the scanning electron microscope. The department plans on offering it in the summer for financial reasons, which is a loss because students will not be able to take it as part of their regular curriculum. S. Boyden said that the conversation should be transparent, so that if curricular proposals are going to be stopped for financial reasons, the bottom line should be clear. J. Touster said that small upper level classes can be subsidized through having large general education science classes. J. O' Donnell said that the same argument can be made as was with nursing, that by increasing the number of students who want an expensive program, some of them will end up in less expensive programs.

R. Leary asked for clarification that Senate had already approved the course but with different credit hours. B. Sweet said yes, but it was not signed, and was held by the provost. There was a discussion of whether the proposal accorded with the CBA.

J. O' Donnell asked about lab fees. K. Whitney said that we are not able to do that locally, but this is a larger issue. There was a discussion.

A. Roberts said that the department appreciates that CCPS and Senate are considering the proposal off cycle. He said there were problems with the process, since there were multiple opportunities for the administration to comment on this much earlier in the process.

There was a vote on the motion. The motion failed (7 for, 8 against, 3 abstentions). J. Phillips said that he hated to have to vote like that, and felt that the vote was under duress, and failed because Senators were objecting to the precedent, not the course itself.

d. University-wide Faculty Development proposal guidelines – A draft of changes to the proposal was sent out. The Policy committee had previously offered a suggestion to remove the term “pilot” for funding for research. There can still be other suggestions. R. Frakes said that a call has not been sent out for the fall round but the deadline in the policy is 10/31. J. Smrekar asked if funding would be reserved for the spring round. S. Boyden said yes.

IX. Adjournment – C. McAleer moved to adjourn, seconded by B. Sweet. The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Occhipinti
Faculty Senate Secretary