

**Faculty Senate
Clarion University
10/23/17**

Faculty Senate met on October 23, 2017 in 246 Gemmell. A. Roberts chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, E. Foster, S. Harris, D. Knepp, A. Lockwood, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, J. McCullough, K. McIntyre, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, B. Sweet, Lorie Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. P. Fackler, T. Pfannestiel, and R. Skunda were also present.

I. Call to Order – A. Roberts called the meeting to order at 3:30.

II. Approval of the Minutes (Sept. 10/10, 2017) – J. Phillips motioned (S. Prezzano seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Interim President – A. Roberts noted that Clarion has a new Interim President. Body applauded.

IV. President's Report – P. Fackler

P. Fackler began by introducing himself, and describing his former tenure at Clarion University, and expressed happiness at being here, and hopes to and looks forward to working with the Senate, and getting to know everyone in what he assumes will be a fairly abbreviated tenure. P. Fackler reported that he had been in Harrisburg at the Board of Governor's meeting, while T. Pfannestiel was still acting president and P. Fackler was not yet appointed. P. Fackler congratulated Clarion on the approval of the BS in Respiratory Care. The BOG also approved a new policy resolution which puts student success as the top priority. This seems to be a non-controversial statement to make, but P. Fackler found it good that the BOG explicitly made the statement. The State System is in the process of redesigning itself, with 3 priorities. The first is the focus on student success, the second is leveraging each university's strengths, and the third is to transform the governance and leadership structure. P. Fackler noted this last point as one of particular interest. PASSHE, and the chair of the BOG seems to be saying that there may be too much bureaucracy. P. Fackler called this view a potential 'deregulation' of the system. P. Fackler suggested he would read various PASSHE policies with an eye toward whether the rules and regulations meet the first priority— student success, and would act to change rules based on whether the rules and regulations contribute to added value, and whether they meet the first priority. P. Fackler suggested that the interest in rolling back bureaucracy seems to be sincere on the part of the BOG.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda reported that student senate revisited and updated the constitution, cleaning up language and making things a bit more explicit and action oriented and concrete. R. Skunda said that 8 senators attended the BSGP conference (board of student government presidents), which was successful. He noted that the Social Equity Dinner is coming up next month, around Nov. 15th.

A. Roberts recognized the outside guests, D. Dollins at this point. The minutes record their comments at the end of this document.

VI. Committee Reports.

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet said that the read-ins (new business) are read in. B. Sweet said CCPS meets tomorrow to consider proposals. The objection date for 10/20. The open hearing is scheduled November 3. Y. Ayad asked about objections and whether proposals can be resubmitting after objections and reconciliation meetings. B. Sweet said that proposals could be resubmitted in this cycle. Goal is to have all business completed by the second to last Senate meeting, so that the last meeting can be used to clean up all remaining CCPS issues.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore is not here, but sent A. Roberts a note of committee happenings. M. Lepore met with S. Fenske discussed partnership and focus group that would provide feedback on the student experience on the scope and

quality of services provided. Will create an Emerging New Professional award to replace the student Who's Who award. Working on dates for next meetings.

C. CCR – J. Lyle

J. Lyle said that the call is out for self-nominations for the 3 positions determined by Faculty Senate to the University Wide Faculty Professional Development Grant Committee. Two nominations are in. Names are needed by next meeting.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report

E. Budget – C. Childers

No report

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

D. Knepp noted that the Mentor dinner is tomorrow night, with approximately 20 mentors and mentees scheduled to attend. P. Gent will speak to the new faculty members on student advising. T. Kitzmiller will speak on Judicial Services, J. Walsh will speak on racial relations, and M Lepore will speak on the tenure process.

G. Institutional Resources – E. Foster

E. Foster wrote to T. Fogarty re: committee meetings and updates. The following is his response.

Ellen:

The update on Tippin is minimal. We are continuing to work with the Department of General Services (DGS) and the identified contactors on the project in an attempt to finalize the plan so that formal notice to proceed may be issued. Because it is a DGS funded and controlled project we are a participant in the discussions but the final notice to proceed is dependent on DGS approval.

The ADA Accessibly Project which is also a DGS Funded Project is in the preliminary stages of design firm selection. Once a design firm is approved the firm will visit campus and the facilities to review needs and options in order to provide a preliminary design. The specific buildings identified as part of this project are Stevens Hall and Moore Hall.

We also have roof replacements in design or planned for Still Hall and Montgomery Hall. The roof for Marwick Boyd was completed this summer.

Tim

T. Pfannestiel noted that, due to the delay in Tippin renovations Winter Commencement will be held in the Tippin. Specific notices will be forthcoming.

H. Venango – J. May

Faculty Forum at Venango is scheduled on an ad hoc basis for this upcoming Thursday from 3:30-5:00pm, while permanent/common times are found.

VII. Old Business

A. By-Laws/General Education Recommendations

Can be brought to floor for discussion. Some concern whether Policy is a 'standing committee' and whether the By Laws can be brought up without a motion. A. Roberts entertains a motion. D. Clark motions, in order to err on the side of care. B. Sweet second. A. Roberts noted that we can discuss, but vote can occur in two weeks.

Change to Constitution Article II Section 4, part 3, *An individual with a workload that is entirely online may designate the campus s/he would like to represent, designating such at the time of nominations and appearing on the*

ballot for that campus (either Clarion or Venango) and eligible to serve on Faculty Senate as a representative of that campus if elected.

Goal is to enable participation by faculty with wholly online duties. Elections personnel did not know where to place wholly online faculty, and the faculty themselves did not know where to place themselves to be on which ballot. Goal with language is to make explicit where online faculty can be placed, so they can be active on campus should they desire to be. T. Pfannestiel noted that, so far as he could count on the top of his head, he thought that there are 5-6 faculty in this position. General discussion noted that the goal was to enable these people to participate and to improve their chances for tenure and promotion, to not be locked out of major university service. E. Foster reported that T. Fogarty said that Clarion does not have specific HR oriented designations, so, in years past, Senate came up with designation based on workload. If a space opens up. D. Lott said if the new wording meant an online faculty who may not have any particular connection to Venango campus, self-designated, then it would reduce, by at least half, the intentional and direct representation of Venango on main campus in Senate. He said that this would be unfair. A department, like Nursing, may institutionally be housed at Venango, but a wholly online faculty member may know nothing about Venango specific issues. In response, discussion centered around whether a designation has to exist, whether an online faculty member can be a 'universal' member, etc. D. Lott reminded Senate of an option previously discussed, of having a separate online designation; a potential 'carve out' for online faculty. J. Touster wondered if Senate size is flexible, and whether an online faculty member could be admitted to Senate if elected, and not increase Senate size if not elected. Discussion about the confusion re: voting cycle. Currently Senate is 24 members, with 1/3 up for election each cycle. E. Foster noted that online faculty will always have trouble getting on Senate, due to lack of identity and name recognition. J. Croskey suggested a non-voting member, kind of like the Student Senate representative. Discussion about a second class citizenship relationship with online faculty. J. Croskey suggested this as a first approximation, to gain name recognition, etc. D. Lott reiterated this, suggesting change of language so that if online faculty became active, the Constitution could be altered in the future to acknowledge that fact. S. Foster acknowledged that all positions have merit, and could be discussed in circles with no solution, but that the best option would be that online faculty have a Clarion seat if they want it. J. Phillips noted that democratic process requires that all people should have a chance to be elected and have a constituency. J. Phillips said that online faculty have to have a way to choose a campus, and that we must make it easier to make the process the democratic. J. Phillips recognizes that it will be difficult for online faculty to get elected, which Senate will have to deal with later, after this initial problem of designation is solved. Y Ayad noted that this discussion has implications for Tenure and Promotion, etc.

A. Roberts called the question, and asked for clarity on D. Lott's motion. D. Lott summarized the previous proposals, and suggested that such language could be altered in the future, but because he can't come up with good language for an amendment, he moves to remove the proposed language. D. Lott moved to remove the language altogether. D. Knepp seconded. A. Roberts called for a vote on D. Lott's motion to remove language. Aye: 5, Nay: 9.

By Law changes

A. Roberts summarized the By Law changes as reducing the subcommittees. In all cases, the reduction in subcommittees did not result in committees losing jurisdiction over those areas of interest.

Article III, Section 1. Part 2, ~~All committees must include at least one elected Senator.~~ Language for committees requiring a Senator. Is redundant if no subcommittees.

Article III, Section 8. Part 1, ~~The Office of Academic Affairs shall report exceptions to graduation standards granted by Deans to it and it shall act as the review board for petitions for graduation from students.~~ This has never been done, and is not work that Senate thinks a committee should have. Also, proposed is to eliminate the subcommittees on Admissions and Athletics. The strike through language is too long to include here.

Article III, Section 8. Part 3, ~~The Committee on Courses and Programs of Study shall have one subcommittee: Subcommittee on General Education and Educational Goals.~~ The entirety of the Council on General Education is stricken, and replaced by *Revisions to the General Education Program of the University, beyond course placement decisions, shall be initiated by the Faculty Senate based upon assessment data received by the Faculty Senate. The Faculty Senate shall appoint a select committee to craft the changes for submission to CCPS which will in turn send a recommendation to the full Faculty Senate.* This formalizes what had gone through Senate last year, with the

dissolution of the Council on General Education, and forms a 'select' committee when appropriate to examine changes to the General Education Program.

Article III, Section 8. Part 5. Removed subcommittees from the Committee on Institutional Resources, but again, kept the purview and areas of concern and interest, should sufficient membership occur that subcommittees are again desired. D. Clark realized that the university wide committee, UTAC, usually takes members from the technology subcommittee, and Senate should notify the head of UTAC to take membership from the larger committee instead of the subcommittee.

Article III, Section 8. Part 6. Removed subcommittees from Committee on Student Affairs, but kept the purview and areas of concern and interest, should sufficient membership occur that subcommittees are again desired. M. Lepore has noted in prior meetings that the subcommittees are essentially merged already anyway.

Article IV, Section 5 had been an amendment to Article IV, so strike that language. Also, added language related to faculty with solely online responsibilities and the duty to attend Senate meetings live if elected: "*Senators with an exclusively online teaching load, and residing more than fifty (50) miles from Clarion University may, upon request, attend Faculty Senate Meetings via a conferencing technology*". This new language can exist along side the unfinished discussion of where, in the constitution, to place online faculty.

A. Roberts will send these changes to the faculty as a whole, and Senate will take up the changes and any suggestions from Faculty at the next Senate meeting.

C. Childers noted that people are currently elected to the various committees and subcommittees that Senate proposes to eliminate, and wondered what would happen. A. Roberts suggested that a reasonable suggestion would be rolling all members into the larger committee, and that, as electoral cycles go, attrition would take care of the problem. S. Boyden suggested giving members of the committees a choice to stay or leave. This would be an issue if someone joined the committee as a result of 'arm twisting' vs joining to provide service and evidence for promotion. General acclimation at the suggestion.

VIII. New Business

A. Enrollment -- D. Dollins

D. Dollins began by summarizing the last two years enrollment patterns before moving to what changes he hopes to make in the enrollment/recruitment process, aims and goals.

D. Dollins presented data from 2017 and 2018. Transfers were up, but First Time I College (FTIC) were down, 877 from 941 the previous year. In Fall '17 from 3,457 total applications, we generated 877 freshmen new students. The goal was 941, which we exceeded by 1 student. D. Dollins noted desire to increase the completed schedules to generate more students. Cal U, Cheyney, Slippery Rock and Westchester all increased enrollments along with us, and all other PASSHE schools saw declines. Many of the other schools saw much larger, or similarly large, declines as those seen at Clarion over the past several years 2005-2017. It is not the case that Clarion is unique or sees larger declines than other PASSHE schools. T. Pfannestiel has noted in previous President Reports that he does not really trust Cal U's numbers.

Fall 17

Applicant Stage	2017 Freshmen	2017 Transfers
Total Applications	3457	738
Total Complete Applications	2728	568
Total Offers	2605	541
Total Deposits	1021	417
Net Deposits	950	414
Scheduled for Classes	877	338
Enrollment Goal	941	312

Starting in Fall '18, D. Dollins noted a philosophic change in the recruitment process. He wants to do more and more regular contact with potential students and with those who have applied and been accepted. Specifically, the office will lead with our academic programs, to put Clarion in “top of mind”, to facilitate a “moment of truth”, and to “win on the visit”. To accomplish these he wants data to give families, anecdotes of experiences during school and the good work done after graduation, etc. D. Dollins wants to focus on student outcomes that we offer. To keep Clarion in “top of mind”, D. Dollins’ office wants to contact students every 14 days or so in a deliberate and intentional manner. D. Dollins wants to focus on features, benefits and outcomes of CUP on students. Managing the “moment of truth” implies that every interaction with students and families is high level. “Winning on the Visit” implies a revamping of the orientation and new student visit days, programming and experiences.

Fall 18 Numbers

As of 10/20/17	Fall 17	Fall 18	%Increase
Total Applications	1105	1115	+1%
FTIC Apps	1076	1070	(.5%)
Transfer Apps	29	45	+55%

119 Non-Resident Apps	46 Ohio Apps	54 Venango Apps (+64% increase)
-----------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------------

As of Friday our FTIC applications are a little down, while transfers are up. Nursing visit day is today. Clarion is gaining many more applications from Ohio, and we are being more intentional about where we spend money and where Clarion sends staff to recruit. Venango applications are up as well. D. Dollins is re-doing brochures, and is starting to send targeted mailings on specific topics, such as housing, financial aid, college information, etc, rather than one large packet with everything.

Anecdotally, D. Dollins is on the mailing list for Slippery Rock, IUP, and Cal U so he can get information on what our competitors are doing. Also, he is getting information from his staff who have kids looking at colleges.

D. Dollins will soon create a steering committee to develop a new enrollment/recruitment plan to guide strategies etc.

D. Dollins asked all of us to send good news to B. Bailey, the appropriate Deans, D. Dollins, etc. The goal is to be data driven about what we offer and about what we are asked about by families, etc. T. Pfannestiel suggested starting with the Deans, in terms of sharing good anecdotes.

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