

**Faculty Senate
Clarion University
10/8/18**

Faculty Senate met on September 10, 2018 in 246 Gemmell. J. Lyle chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: L. Chambers, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, E. Foster, J. Knaust, D. Knepp, C. Li, L. Lillard, D. Lott, A. Love, J. Lyle, J. McCullough, J. Overly, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, A. Rosati, B. Sweet, P. Woodburne. D. Pehrsson, P. Gent, S. Fenske, R. Skunda, J. Geiger, M. Shaffer, and T. Kitzmiller were also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Lyle called the meeting to order at 3:30.

II. Approval of the Minutes (9/24, 2018) – A. Roberts, (E. Foster seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

J. Lyle commented on the upcoming Chancellor's Visit – October 16.

IV. President's Report-- D. Pehrsson

D. Pehrsson noted two items. First was the kickoff to the \$7 million campaign focusing on athletic scholarships and facility upgrades (more to be said by J. Geiger below). These funds will go to scholarships and to various upgrades. The second item was to officially ask the Senate to call for committee members to sit on the CAES Dean Search Committee. She has asked J. Allen, Dean of COHSHS, to be co-chair, and will ask that one of the 5 members chosen by Senate to be the other co-chair. D. Pehrsson said she survived and enjoyed her first ALF.

V. Provost Report—P. Gent

P. Gent also discussed two items. First is to announce D. Sobina as the full time Assistant Dean for COHHS. She will begin officially on Oct. 15, and had been $\frac{3}{4}$ time, also running the Venango campus, which proved too much. H. Lineman will take over in D. Sobina's Venango capacity, at least until the direction of Venango campus is made clearer with the issuance of the Venango Task Force Report (November), and possibly until June, 2019. Second, P. Gent noted the distribution of the executive summary of the work the GEEC has done during the past summers. She noted that the group recognized that some learning outcomes were not as assessable as hoped, and the committee had revised some outcomes, both in wording and in number. Also the group created some rubrics. P. Gent noted that diversity related issues are still a Middle States concern.

VI. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda noted that the leadership conference--BSGP conference (board of student government presidents) -- a couple weeks ago in Bloomsburg was a success, giving many ideas on how to improve Student Senate and issues to work on. At this retreat he met with the new Chancellor, who had been in Harrisburg earlier that day. Student Senate is looking at their constitution, and still looking at scholarships and various affordability issues.

VII. Committee Reports.

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

CCPS read-ins were sent out and are now read in. Also, B. Sweet noted the deadlines; Oct. 19th is the date for objections. CCPS will meet this Wednesday and next, which is two days prior to the objection deadline. He appeals for objections to come in earlier if possible. Open hearings are held Nov. 4th, and

proposals will be brought to Senate on Nov. 19th, which, he suggested was a good way to start the Thanksgiving holiday.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore is giving a keynote speech in Winchester, VA, and cannot report.

C. CCR – J. Knaust

J. Knaust noted that slate for Senate committees is filled. As this comes to senate from a committee, it does not need a second. Discussion included appreciation from A. Roberts and E. Foster. CCR had a good many of candidates. Consolidation of sub-committees seems to have helped. Vote called, and slate accepted. The call for the True North Initiative has garnered some interest—handful of responses. Needs a response from COBAIS. Suggested administration ask P. Frese to twist some arms. J. Overly asked about the work load. A. Roberts noted the short time line, and the charge will result in some real work. Given the president's notice, a call for CAES Dean search will go out. Given short time line for the TNI, any nominations will be handled via email, and reported sooner than the next full Senate meeting.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No Report. Now has a slate of committee, will call a meeting.

E. Budget – A. Roberts

A. Roberts noted that Len Cullo will be invited Oct. 22nd. Together with J. Croskey A. Roberts met with L. Cullo and discussed the relationship between CUP and the Foundation, as regards housing costs. Because housing is owned by the Foundation, pricing is determined by the Foundation, with limited input from CUP. A major determinant of housing costs comes from covenants in the bond issuances that funded the housing. Bond covenants for the SOMN and SOMS require a revenue/expense ratio of 1.2, thus revenues must exceed expenses by 20%. This puts a continued upper trend on rents. A. Roberts noted that 'expenses' are not what we may expect. Interest payments are not an expense in this case. L. Cullo noted that it would be good to create the housing as an aggregate, but each was funded by a different bond issuance, and have different covenants. This also means that it is very difficult for CUP to do anything except discount housing costs on a case by case basis. L. Cullo noted that it makes little sense for the Foundation to be our landlord. We could buy all the housing. This would require \$100 million in bonds to repay the existing bonds. PASSHE would not object per se, but we would need to show significant cost savings to the university. As the bonds are at a very low interest rate, we would be unlikely to be able to show such a savings. We would show some savings, as in the rent paid for The DEN, the Starbucks, and the University Theater, which we would save. The Facilities Master Plan calls for the demolition of Carrier Hall at some point, and have them move into a refurbished Egbert Hall. L. Cullo, apparently thinks that it would be cheaper to refurbish some of the SOMN or SOMS space for this need, and not charge ourselves rent.

Addressing some rumors, apparently CUP does NOT put new freshmen in Reinhard Village, and we DO NOT rent space in Reinhard Village to NON students. The two year residence requirement is mentioned in the bond covenants, but is not required by the covenants.

SOM generally is about 60% occupied, with many fewer in SOMN than SOMS. Hilltop have 84% occupancy rate, while Reinhard Village is about 90%. Reinhard Village is the cheapest.

One issue raised in a question by D. Lott was that if prices were lowered, would we perhaps get more students, as per economic theory, thereby meeting the 1.2 ratio requirement at a lower price. A. Roberts noted that L. Cullo recognized this too, but that it may appear too risky to the foundation.

Negotiation with bond holders is possible, but they typically come to the table when they are not being paid. To go that route to get a seat at the table seems self-destructive now.

F Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

Mentor Dinner is slated for Oct. 23, with more mentors than mentees so far. His committee is in the process of pairing up the mentors and mentees now.

G. Institutional Resources – A. Love

A. Love noted that Tippin renovation is continuing, though a bit behind schedule, due to the finding of coal and asbestos abatement. F. Connolly still expects completion on time. F. Connolly showed A. Love the most recent plans, which do not include classrooms, though do include four meeting hall spaces. F. Connolly said that none of the plans he has seen have ever included classrooms. Also, the most recent plans seem to show many more toilets than in prior plans. ADA compliance work being done on Stevens Hall and the Special Ed building continues with plans being put out to bid. The roof on Still Hall is put off for a year. ADA issues at Venango are in very early stages. Looking for money, but some communication with architects seem to have occurred. Currently on hold. A rebid is needed for Montgomery Hall roof. F. Connolly will give A. Love the minutes from the committee meetings.

H. Venango – J. May

J. May was absent. E. Foster noted that one issue that would have been discussed is that the Task Force is meeting on Oct. 10th.

VIII. Old Business

A. Seifert Cultural Series

CCR will go forward with the appointment of individuals for the next year's appointments. Deal with in Spring

B. Retiree emails update. No update from S. Puleio.

C. Affordability issues.

J. Lyle reviewed the history of the parking permit issue, as relates to affordability. Parking fees for students first came up at a discussion at Senate (9/24) and again at Policy (10/1). Chief Hendershott noted that the fees go to paving and to cameras that provide safety, but he would look at the fees. J. Lyle reviewed a question first raised at Policy which was why CUP cannot have 'fall only' parking permits. Passes cost \$150, and seem to be the same price for all parking options. Students do graduate in fall, so why not allow 'fall only passes'. Most universities have differential pricing by location, as per economic theory. Students seem to compete for a parking lottery, not for a guaranteed slice. J. Lyle reiterated the desire expressed at that earlier Policy meeting that perhaps someone from Public Safety could come to Senate in spring.

IX. New Business

A. Fundraising etc—J. Geiger

The first item presented was a recognition that S. Prezzano was recognized at the Distinguished Faculty Award Celebration. The body applauded in appreciation of the fine work done by S. Prezzano over the years. The second order of business was continued discussion of the \$7 million scholarship fundraising campaign. This campaign was kicked off the prior Saturday. While this is on-going, the university will also begin to set priorities for the rest of the university.

To that end, he asked for suggestions from faculty regarding things that are specific and unique to Clarion that would entice donors to give. This campaign will kick off Fall '19. While it is possible to see the topics and ideas from last year, or the last time a campaign was begun, it is worth noting that times have changed, and needs have likely changed. In response to a question from A. Roberts, J. Geiger stressed the focus on specific items that we need, what makes Clarion unique in the eyes of potential students and donors, and how the things we suggest will build retention, and our reputation for excellence. He suggested framing the need requests from the perspective of how the request may increase student centered research possibilities, enhance retention, student experiential learning, and broadly that which will draw new students to Clarion and keep them here. In response to a question from J. Phillips, J. Geiger noted that this athletic scholarship is a 4 year campaign, and that it will eventually be folded into the larger campaign discussed above.

J. Lyle asked about the 150th anniversary, and why little of what had been planned actually occurred. J. Geiger noted that the plans were largely an administration desire, and that the various well-publicized problems at Clarion and in the PASSHE broadly (faculty strike, etc) caused donors to want to put off donations until the climate improved. Donors said that they did not want to give money if Clarion was to become "Slippery Rock North". He noted that the entire leadership at Clarion has changed (except perhaps P. Frese in COBAIS), and that climate seems to have improved, and donors seem to have a good deal more optimism and are willing to donate to a brighter future for Clarion. The various donation initiatives are on-going, but without specific reference to the 150th anniversary.

B. BART and Academic Issues—M. Shaffer and T. Kitzmiller

The first issue is to report on the result of a survey of BART activities and student cases. Between 2015 and 2018 199 unique BART cases were handled. Of these, some 34 have graduated, 87 are still enrolled, and the remainder, 78 (39%), have not been retained. M. Shaffer considers this too high, and noted that emotional, academic, and financial pressures all come into play, and are not all solvable with BART. M. Shaffer noted that there is no waiting list, though the office has been busy, and that October, for whatever reason, is typically a busy month. The office is committed to meeting needs, and getting students the resources they need. D. Lott asked who the Venango contact is for BART, given Dr. Aubele's departure. M. Shaffer said that S. Hoke and M. Shaffer would be the contact people if and until a new person is hired. D. Clark asked about the threshold of concern, and how to tell if a student uses the phrase "I am so depressed" colloquially vs in a literal clinical sense. S. Fenske noted that the general view is to note if the behavior is different from what faculty have seen as a baseline. M. Shaffer augmented that view to suggest that something that may seem colloquial to one faculty, when reported and combined with similar reports from other faculty, may indicate a deeper problem. He suggested reporting the incident, and letting BART sort it out. Sort of a 'better safe than sorry' approach.

T. Kitzmiller reported on the NASPA survey from the Center for First-Generation Student Success, and how CUP students compare/benchmark to the national averages for student conduct and academics. The full report was delivered by email from P. Gent on 10/5. The summary noted positive findings and areas for improvement surrounding the code of conduct related to alcohol consumption and cheating, and related areas. One example is given below:

Areas for Improvement:

- Over 55% of respondents are not aware that parents/guardians are notified of policy violations involving alcohol.
- Almost 50% of respondents don't know that there are minimum sanctions related to AOD violations.
- Over 55% of respondents don't know about the medical amnesty policy related to AOD.
- 51% of respondents don't know where to find a copy of the Code of Conduct.
- 62% of respondents don't know where to report a possible violation of the Code.
- Over 57% of respondents indicated that faculty/staff never discussed falsifying/fabricating course lab data with them.
- 50% of respondents indicated that faculty/staff never discussed falsifying/fabricating research data with them.
- Approximately 45% of respondents have witnessed cheating during a test or exam at CU at least one time.
- Over 60% of respondents indicated that they are not aware of how to report cheating.
- Over 50% of respondents are unlikely to report cheating in the future if they are aware of it.

J. Phillips noted that the seeming lack of direction on falsifying data may be resolved by specific inclusion into the new Inquiry Seminars, required of all freshmen. These classes may have an easier time incorporating such issues directly into the curriculum, where it may be harder to do in a more content heavy course. The advantage is that all students would be hit with these instructions. They would have the topic reinforced later on, especially in research-heavy courses. J. Phillips suggested that someone from Judicial Affairs could visit these classes, or issue a 'white paper' to all faculty. In this way, all students would have essentially the same instruction on the topic, at least as a baseline.

While the percentages seem high, it is possible that many of those who say they have not been instructed in falsifying research data are students in majors where research is less stressed (compared to the hard sciences, for example).

J. Lyle and others noted that some other schools, such as Cornell and Indiana, have an online 'class/program' that students need to take and retake during their college career. Students may or may not get a certificate, or may or may not be able to begin the course content in a D2L environment until the program is completed. J. Knaust noted that she puts a statement on every exam where students, by signing the exam, say they know and abide by the honor code. A. Rosati noted that, in the not so distant past, CUP had a policy of reporting cases of deliberate and accidental plagiarism/cheating, and wondered if this was current. The idea is that, similar to BART, a record of infractions can be created. This allows CUP to distinguish between first time and repeat offenders. T. Kitzmiller stressed the importance of submission of seemingly small and/or accidental cases. Many cases of cheating etc are handled in-class, and never get told to Judicial Affairs. Currently virtually all cases of cheating that come to Judicial Affairs go to a board hearing. A. Rosati and C. Childers noted that perhaps a sliding scale could be created that an accidental case would not go before a board hearing, etc, but repeat offenders would be handled differently than at present. T. Kitzmiller suggested that perhaps standards/minimum sanctions could be changed for first time offenders. Could work through Student Affairs committee.

C. Gen Ed Assessment Document/Committee

J. Lyle recapped discussion from Policy, related to the need for Senate to be involved in the Gen Ed assessment process. Policy discussed creation of a 3 person committee, made up of senators separate from those senators on GEEC and/or on CCPS, and that it would be tailored narrowly, with 1 year terms, to look at specific issues. This select committee would offer guidance and act

as a liaison between GEEC, Senate, and CCPS. Of particular interest is the assessment work done in 2016, 17, 18. This committee would direct/suggest/offer guidance on assessment and on making recommendations.

J. Phillips moved to create such a committee. E. Foster seconded. Discussion noted that the committee would need to be created quickly, either via a CCR call, or from the floor via nomination or self-nomination. Some members are absent, and will be notified, so they can volunteer if they wish. Vote called and passed.

J. Phillips, A. Love, and D. Knepp volunteered, self-nominated, or were nominated and accepted.

X. Adjournment –moved (B. Sweet, A. Roberts, seconded). Unanimous passage.