

Faculty Senate Clarion University

Faculty Senate met on May 1, 2017 in 246 Gemmell. J. Phillips chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, B. Frakes, D. Knepp, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, B. Sweet, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. L. Chambers, P. Gent, R. Lane, T. Pfannestiel, R. Skunda, and B. Smith were also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:42 in the lower level of Gemmell following tornadic events.

II. Approval of the Minutes (April 17, 2017) – J. Croskey motioned (B. Frakes seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously. J. Phillips thanked J. Lyle for his service as secretary for the year.

III. Announcements

Retirement Reception – J. Phillips noted that the retirement reception for faculty would be tomorrow at 4:00. Speeches – J. Phillips thanked T. Pfannestiel, J. Croskey, and J. Lyle for their participation in Academic Convocation.

IV. President's Report – T. Pfannestiel for K. Whitney

T. Pfannestiel began by thanking folks for a great year and working thru a number of matters. He stated that he knows it can be hard work. He thanked those finishing their terms on Senate and those elected to serve in 2017-2018. T. Pfannestiel said he was looking forward to working together in the fall.

T. Pfannestiel gave search updates. Regarding the search for the AVP of Enrollment Management he said that the process is finishing. The search committee is making recs on Tuesday. T. Pfannestiel was confident we had a candidate worth hiring and said he hoped to announce a hire in the next week. Regarding HHS he said that the last candidate was here today. He said that we have three quality persons who seem to be resonating with the search committee members. He again said that we were trying to seal the process up quickly. The committee meets Thursday. The provost said he hoped to make an announcement in the next week or so.

T. Pfannestiel said we are still working on the academic calendar. He said he needed advice on whether to shrink winter break. The provost said it seems like there is unanimous support to shrink break but keep a winter session and asked for thoughts about going back to 3.5 weeks. He noted that one concern from a chair was that such a change means no time off during the holidays. Many senators supported 3.5 weeks. J. Phillips said it would make for consistency between summer 1 and winter session. T. Pfannestiel said he hopes to bring the new calendar to the 1st meeting in the fall. J. Touster said that if we shrink spring by a week and summer goes earlier that could impact our ability to get non-CUP students for summer classes. A. Roberts asked what the finals schedule would look like. T. Pfannestiel said it would be Monday-Thursday.

C. Childers asked about the status of the State System review given the recent visit. T. Pfannestiel said he was disappointed with the brevity of the meetings but added that he felt the general reaction was positive. He noted that the firm agreed that stories of mergers/closures are ridiculous and need to stop. He said that the review also was about the overall structure more than particular universities. E. Foster said she was impressed that the consultants knew the differences between state-owned and state related institutions and the relevant funding structures. J. Phillips concurred. J. Phillips also noted that the consultants were respectful and felt they seemed to identify the lack of an overall coordinating board for the state system to ensure consistency across different types of schools as a key issue. He felt it was a collegial meeting, and said he felt much better about things as it was clear mergers/closures is not driving their evaluations. He pointed out that the consultants asked if the state really needs a chancellor's office to which J. Phillips said no because of forced competition within the locked structure. J. Phillips then noted that there is a Chronicle article out today about Clarion.

E. Foster said she knows that the retrenchment letter is out there and asked administration to please give a sufficient head's up to persons ASAP so that they can prepare and remain in the hiring loop. T. Pfannestiel said administration has started discussions with APSCUF and reached out to programs that are struggling to ensure growth and sustainability.

A. Roberts asked if we would renew the provost search for next year. T. Pfannestiel said he did not know when exactly that process would pick back up with the end of the calendar looming. He hoped to know more by July 1.

D. Knepp inquired about the Tippin bid process. T. Pfannestiel said he has heard nothing yet which is good news. The plan is to open bids and make a decision. A. Roberts said bids were extended to Wednesday. T. Pfannestiel hoped this part of the process would be wrapped up by mid-summer.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that nominations for Executive Board would be taking place this evening. He said he hoped to see everyone in the fall.

VI. Committee Reports.

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B Sweet said he had new business. B. Sweet read a statement from CCPS to Senate regarding the review of curricular proposals:

Whereas the Faculty Senate bylaws state that the Committee on Courses and Programs of Study (CCPS) "shall review all proposals relating to courses and programs of study, evaluate them in the context of the curriculum of the entire University, and make recommendations thereon to the Faculty Senate", the committee feels it is beyond their purview and a conflict of interest to facilitate the actual creation of curricular proposals of Clarion University and request Senate form an ad-hoc committee to research, write, and propose any such potential changes in the future.

J. Phillips noted the concern and apologized for the situation. B. Sweet said he realizes the by-laws would remedy this if the pending changes were adopted. J. Phillips thanked B. Sweet, and the rest of the committee, for serving on CCPS.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore said that the committee met and agreed to replace Who's Who. He distributed a copy of award ideas the committee is considering and asked people to let him know if they have comments/suggestions. The goal is to have a new structure in place for spring 2018. J. Touster suggested leaving the field blank so departments can specify on their own. M. Lepore said that committee has discussed the academic calendar. He also said that the committee is looking into ways to streamline the RSO budget process to reduce lost funds. J. Phillips thanked M. Lepore and the rest of his committee for their service to the university.

C. CCR – E. Foster

E Foster said that Senate had an election. She stated that the new roster had been distributed. J. Phillips thanked E. Foster and the rest of CCR for their service to the university.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report. The Senate thanked J. Phillips and the rest of the committee for their service to the university.

E. Budget – C. Childers

No report. J. Phillips thanked C. Childers and the rest of the committee for their service to the university.

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

D. Knepp stated that we still have four of the eleven retirees for the upcoming ceremony. J. Phillips thanked D. Knepp and the rest of the committee for their service to the university.

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

A Roberts said that the Tippin bids had been delayed a few days as noted above. He indicated the next facilities planning meeting would be in the fall. J. Phillips thanked A. Roberts and his committee for their service. J. Phillips also thanked A. Roberts for serving as the chair of CCPS in fall while B. Sweet was on sabbatical.

H. Venango – J. May

J. May said that there were questions about how full-time, online nursing faculty could get on Senate. She noted that she was working with E. Foster to get answers. E. Foster noted that the issue is not with T. Fogarty. J. Phillips thanked J. May and the rest of the committee for their service to the university.

VII. Old Business

A. By-Laws/General Education Recommendations

Still old, still business.

VIII. New Business

- A. CCPS Read-ins – They were read-in. B. Sweet also noted that he sent folks the dormant course list.
- B. CCPS Proposals (Action Items)

B Sweet took up proposals that were tabled at the previous meeting.

He began with proposal 117. B. Sweet noted that it was resubmitted with changes. CCPS approves the proposal. E.Foster moved to untable, A. Roberts seconded. Unanimously untabled. After brief discussion, the proposal passed unanimously.

Senate then moved to 200-202 (Inquiry Seminars). B. Frakes moved, Y. Ayad seconded, to unable. Unanimously untabled. B. Sweet noted that he extended the comment period and received comments. He said that 200 was amended with the changes announced/explained in email. CCPS met and approved the proposal again, so all of them come with positive recommendations.

J. Phillips said that he wants a vote on the proposals with no abstentions. He asked people to vote their consciences. He noted that we started this discussion two years ago and have come back to finish it. He said that he likes the seminars so he may be biased but he thinks the requirement is good.

J. Touster asked if not enough sections are offered for students to take will they be waived thru. T. Pfannestiel said yes. T. Pfannestiel admitted that implementation can be choppy but said he will work to ensure availability for all.

J. Phillips asked if the president will accept the proposal if we approve it; T. Pfannestiel said yes and added that she is very supportive.

J. Croskey asked if we will use INQ which means the courses will not fall under the Arts & Humanities. L. Chambers said that they will all go as Liberal Education Skills because that is where they belong. T. Pfannestiel added that this also will protect content currently being taught under other general education requirements.

P. Woodburne noted that he is conflicted as his concern is financial. T. Pfannestiel said there is no “tax” and added that we can cover all 25 person classes. T. Pfannestiel said that if he thought there would be money issues he would not back the proposals as he does. J. May said her concern is where these fit given the potential for retrenchment. T. Pfannestiel said that while he is limited in what he can say about retrenchment he can say that based on the last time around there are opportunities for Seminars to support students and faculty. D. Clark said he gets the need to be vague but thinks that retrenchment means we need to save money and wondered if adding sections was antithetical to that. T. Pfannestiel said that unfortunately this is the wrong forum to discuss some of this but noted that as a former dean he would say that he thinks we can offset lower-enrolled courses so that this is a revenue generator.

A. Roberts noted that professional programs previously were concerned so he wanted to know how they feel. D. Knepp said he has programs that are likely to ask for exemptions. P. Gent suggested that the placement in gen ed addresses some concerns. B. Sweet said he thinks he can ask CCPS to try and expedite exemptions early in the semester. T. Pfannestiel said he appreciates the idea of the exemption.

J. Phillips called for a vote on all 3 proposals together. All three proposals passed with A. Roberts opposing.

C. General Education Policy (**ACTION ITEM**)

P. Woodburne motioned and E. Foster seconded for consideration of a new general education policy. R. Leary asked if we have a policy now and what the differences were. T. Pfannestiel said we do and that the new one is not really different (it

has different emphases). T. Pfannestiel noted that is virtually word for word what the PASSHE policy is. Proposal passed unanimously.

D. W-Flag Outcomes (**ACTION ITEM**)

J. Phillips noted that these changes had been distributed. He said that he thinks we need to have an ad hoc committee look at these instead of CCPS action prior to Senate. J. Phillips noted that we indeed pressed to consider this now.

P. Gent noted that we are doing assessment for Middle States and cited the need to improve the outcomes. She said that previous outcomes that were designed were not done with assessment in mind. She said that it seems like we write less than other PASSHE schools.

J. Phillips asked if people have comments about how to move forward. B. Sweet asked if there will be a more specific set of guidelines and will this require existing courses to be recertified. P. Gent said we could recertify or simply ask people to demonstrate how they meet the new outcomes. B. Sweet asked to whom people would report. P. Gent said it would not be a Faculty Senate-based ad hoc committee and that there is a university committee. She said we want to demonstrate to Middle States that we have closed the loop, which would help us do gen ed assessment.

R. Leary asked if these changes have been shared with folks who teach these courses. P. Gent said no, she brought them here first. R. Leary said he would be interested in hearing if W-flag folks have concerns. T. Pfannestiel asked if people who teach these courses here have issues. B. Frakes said his concern is with who has teeth to enforce the changes but suggested that otherwise they seem intuitive. K. McIntyre also said they seem intuitive. P. Woodburne asked what multiple assignments mean. E. Foster said she thinks this document finetunes the existing outcomes to make them assessable and added that she does not think there are landmines in here. J. Touster asked what happens if a student takes a flag but not ENG 111. B. Sweet said that if a course has the flag they get the flag. J. Touster noted that his department has first-year labs with flags so he wondered if this blocks students. E. Foster said she is not sure if student enrollment would be impacted for particular courses. J. Overly said she thought there could be a number of folks who are impacted. D. Lott asked when do the students (noted by Touster) take ENG111; J. Touster said it depends on when they can get it. B. Sweet asked if we have flag students without ENG 111. P. Gent said she was not sure of how many.

There was then a discussion of the need for revisions. J. Touster said that they don't do a lot of revision because not relevant to what the assignments entail. R. Leary said that in the requirements there is use of "and" which means they need to do all of the requirements so there may be some leeway needed (E. Foster suggested "such as").

A Roberts noted that a motion to approve is out of order because this is a curricular change so it must go to CCPS. J. Phillips agreed with A. Roberts.

D Lott asked how would this be policed. J. Phillips said he has no notion of how to police; this just changes outcomes for assessment.

J. Phillips said we can send this to CCPS and they can accept it as-is but not this semester. E. Foster moved to send the proposal to CCPS w amendments, S. Prezzano seconded.

K. McIntyre asked if chairs can enforce this stuff. E. Foster said yes and added that this seems like GEEC purview.

J. Phillips noted that we have procedural and timeline problems, but it seems like this will be passed to send along, and he added that we probably can send this as a projected document though it is not possible to put this into syllabi not but say the outcomes are prospectively to be passed. He said we can make it an issue for the minutes to show likely outcome but stressed that we need to follow procedures. T. Pfannestiel offered a suggestion that Senate support resolution of support for the idea knowing that CCPS needs to address the actual proposal. J. Phillips agreed that we would have a resolution of approval that acknowledges the potential for modification. There was unanimous support for sending this to CCPS. E. Foster motioned support of a resolution of tacit approval knowing CCPS needs to do their work (P. Woodburne seconded); motion passed unanimously.

IX. Adjournment – B. Frakes moved (B. Sweet seconded). Unanimous passage.