

**Faculty Senate
Clarion University
2/26/18**

Faculty Senate met on February 26, 2018 in 246 Gemmell. A. Roberts chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, D. Clark, J. Croskey, E. Foster, J. Knaust, D. Knepp, M. Lepore, A. Lockwood, D. Lott, J Lyle, J. May, K. McIntyre, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, A. Rosati, B. Sweet, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. P. Fackler, R. Skunda were also present.

I. Call to Order – A. Roberts called the meeting to order at 4:00.

Odd time due to agreed-upon delay due to first presidential candidate open forum.

II. Approval of the Minutes (2/12, 2018) – E. Foster, (L. Taylor seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

A. Roberts noted that interviews were moving forward for Student Trustee position. He also noted the first presidential candidate open forum.

IV. President's Report--T. Pfannestiel

P. Fackler discussed the Provost search. P. Fackler noted that he wanted to move ahead with the search with a smaller committee, and one to which he felt it important that he appoint the majority. P. Fackler said his goal was to get a good search, with a diverse committee, which followed the spirit of the memorandum, to wit, having an open search, one designed to assure collegial involvement with all relevant constituencies, one that reflects diversity as it relates to gender and ethnicity, etc. Having said this, P. Fackler said, following Haines, the president has the ultimate responsibility to assure that the search and screen process for administrative appointments is of high quality. To this end, he felt he needed to control the chair of the committee, and to appoint the majority of the committee, (which connect to presidential responsibility to ensure a good search). The third thing he wanted to do was to shrink the committee size. P. Fackler cited effective committee working and logistics. A desire of P. Fackler was to have 4 faculty members appointed, and one from APSCUF. Subsequently, he found that the APSCUF appointment was not specified either by Haines or by the CBA, so he dropped that request.

He and A. Roberts had met yesterday (Sunday, 2/25) to go over this issue, and faculty concerns about the search not following the Haines Memorandum, which specifies the make-up of, and other rules for, various search committees. As a result of that meeting, a compromise was reached where by faculty would nominate 6, but the president would appoint the chair of the committee, and would appoint 7 to the committee. P. Fackler had wanted Senate to appoint 4, and APSCUF appoint 1, but now recognizes that the APSCUF appointment is not required by the CBA. P. Fackler stressed the desire for collegiality.

S. Boyden asked how the proposal differs from Haines. A. Roberts outlined the Haines structure; 10 committee members, 6 of which are faculty appointees, and 4 are administration appointees.

In response to a question from J. Phillips asking about an argument in favor of his position, P. Fackler noted that a committee of 6 faculty members and 7 others was unwieldly. His goal was to have an efficient committee

J. Touster said that he understood the desire to do this search without the search firm, but wondered about money paid to the firm. P. Fackler said the firm had been paid 2/3 of their fee, and would get the rest if

they helped with another search. However, no matter what, CUP was unable to recoup any of the fee already paid.

J. Phillips noted that he was glad the president wanted an official policy, after many years in which the then-provost operated on an ad-hoc basis, without benefit of policy. A good written policy aids against arbitrary behavior. J. Phillips asked for an argument in support of the President's position. P. Fackler argued that the Provost is important to the president, and reports directly to the president. Thus, presidential input and control is important for this position. He also argued for a logistically coherent and efficient committee. P. Fackler further noted that Haines was written in the 1960s, when CUP was a teachers college, and all aspects of the university mission and processes were different. In light of all these issues, he argued for a smaller committee and control over the committee chair.

P. Fackler argued that the fight was small potatoes. What he really wanted was to create an effective and diverse committee, with the goal of appointing a good provost.

A. Roberts asked about the timeline for nominations, to which P. Fackler said that he would like the nominations ASAP. Still working on an ad and prospectus.

B. Sweet closed the discussion by noting the years of bad feeling between prior administrations and Senate by administration acting in ad-hoc ways and not following the established rules. He hoped P. Fackler would have come to the Senate and discuss it, and that he could understand why he found the language used by the president, "setting aside" of Haines, so disturbing. P. Fackler acknowledged it.

V. Student Senate –

R. Skunda noted that Wingo had been held last Friday, February 23rd which seemed to have been a success. Also, he and other senators went to 'Advocacy Day' held in the State Capital, which he found to be very interesting. He noted a lack of security around the Capitol building and state representative office areas. R. Skunda met with Donna Oberlander and with Scott Hutchinson's staff. He reported that the legislature seems more willing to fund higher education than in the past, and that Rep. Oberlander opposes raising the minimum wage.

VI. Committee Reports.

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet noted some 'read-ins' had been read-in, and the date for forma objections is 3/23. Open hearings should occur on April 5, but he is having trouble with committee schedules.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore noted that the 'advisory committee' created by S. Fenske, met on Wednesday to consider student issues. Their next meeting is April 11. The next Student Affairs meeting is March 19. In the Advisory committee meeting, students raised concerns about not knowing how to use CU Connect, and never using it. They report preference for email and twitter for day to day communications. For events, flyers, and weather announcements they like social media announcements. Students report wanting more texts regarding weather, and having the decision to show up to class not being made by faculty. Students want bus service on Sunday, and are not happy with Eagle Commons food. They like Gemmell food better. An issue facing soon-to-be alumni is the potential decision to take down alumni emails after graduation. CUP email is seen as valuable.

A. Roberts noted that the same is being considered for retirees, due to cost. Both are considered, ostensibly for budgetary reasons. S. Prezzano noted that this argument was absurd. Keeping emails cannot be too costly, given the deficits facing the university. Additionally, she noted that emeriti may

write articles and bring fame to the university, but now do not have an email. Discussion noted that emeriti and retirees are good donors. A. Roberts noted that cutting off a good direct source of funds is stupid. P. Fackler agreed, and has a folder. S. Boyden wants the administration to fight this.

P. Fackler said that the decision to shut down retirees emails is coming from legal counsel at the AG office. Will try to get info for Senate.

Some schools have separate alumni email systems, instead of a student account.

C. CCR – J. Lyle

No report, after the new business.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report after the new business

E. Budget – J. Knaust

J. Knaust talked to L. Cullo re: the interim BUD report, and other issues. L. Cullo will come to senate with the 'interim budget'. J. Knaust discussed the BUD report from 2017-2018. The revised budget shows a larger 'melt' of students not enrolling than is typical. The result is a \$900,000 reduction in revenue. Other deficits and expenses may push the deficit to \$2 million. She stressed that this is not due to any big expenses which were not known before. The issue is more that the good news last year was due to a lot of "one-off" good things happening. They are not happening this year. P. Fackler wants more information and analysis of retention issues. He noted that PASSHE often talks about Clarion in the same breath as it does about Cheyney and Mansfield. This is not good company.

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

No report

G. Institutional Resources – E. Foster

E. Foster noted that the next meeting was to be March 22, and that P. Woodburne would again go in her stead. E. Foster noted that, as J. Lyle had noted at a prior meeting, the Starbucks, Denny's DEN, and the Bookstore have no ADA compliant entry. While the building and entryways were built to code, as per T. Fogarty, any changes have to be paid for by CUP and not the foundation, which owns the buildings. T. Fogarty's response to E. Foster is below:

Ellen:

Your message on the posting reminded me that I needed to get back to you on the accessibility issue for Starbucks and the Bookstore.

The construction answer is that the doors meets code requirements. Here is the general information on the doors related to code requirements.

The selection and installation of the doors at the retail operations were done to meet code. There is a certain weight and pull level on the doors and hinges and again those meet the code.

With that said, I discussed the issue with Susanne Fenske and Chad Thomas and they both agree that it would be preferable to have the push button door operation that is more commonly found.

We are in the process of obtaining pricing on the cost to make this conversion at Starbucks, the Bookstore and the Den. Bad news is, modification to the building is on the university as opposed to the Foundation. As soon as we have pricing we are going to work to identify funding so we can, at a minimum, have at least one entrance to each area completed immediately. Surprising (at least to me) there are eight total entrance doors between the three operations; two at Starbucks and three each to the Den and the Bookstore. Depending on cost and funding we may need to budget the additional doors in an upcoming budget cycle.

Tim

H. Venango – J. May

No report

VII. Old Business

A. By Laws/Constitution

A. Roberts noted that he had passed along the language voted on at the last senate meeting to the President, who expects it to go to the Trustees at the next meeting.

B. Seifert Cultural Series

A. Roberts had not received any feedback from T. Pfannestiel regarding the Seifert Committee. K. McIntyre noted that the Seifert Cultural Series is being moved to UAB. She, P. Terman, and K. Yenerall were upset about this, and were due to meet with S. Fenske. Past practice had been to have faculty control. Policy seems changed. K. McIntyre said that S. Fenske would try to include faculty. The goal is to replicate the process of other student based committees. S. Prezzano reiterated that the series was academic in tone, and had been successful in this format. As such, it should remain under academic/faculty control, and not UAB or Student Affairs. K. McIntyre fears it a done deal, but the three will meet with the Provost. P. Fackler said he'd bring new information to the next Senate meeting.

VIII. New Business

A. Academic Policies.

The committee worked on changes to Add/Drop policies, AIPS, changes in minors, and academic renewal.

i. Academic Renewal

J. Phillips reiterated that proposed changes to the academic renewal policy come from the administration. Essentially, CUP can allow some credits be removed from the GPA, and new classes taken, or those classes retaken, particularly if some length of time has passed. The issue is that third parties may or may not accept the CUP methodology for calculating GPA and transcripts. The proposed language is the disclaimer reproduced below:

Disclaimer: Academic Renewal by Clarion University does not guarantee that other institutions or employers will accept the standards of said policy. Many graduate and professional degree programs disregard undergraduate institutional policies, and compute the undergraduate GPA utilizing all hours attempted when determining admission. Clarion University makes no guarantees as to how employers, certifying agencies, or other higher education institutions, including graduate school, professional schools and their common application systems (CAS), or other offices interpret the transcript of a student utilizing the Academic Renewal policy.

It is the student's responsibility to determine the implications of the Academic Renewal GPA for each institutions' admissions process.

Discussion asked how these classes and grades are noted in the transcript. J. Phillips said that classes and grades appear, but are notated in the transcripts. A. Roberts and B. Sweet noted that law schools and med schools often look at ALL transcripts, and that this disclaimer seeks to remove any liability from CUP if a student does not get into law or med school (or other school) due to the use of a renewal policy.

Vote called. Ayes unanimous. Motion passed.

ii. Minors

J. Phillips again noted the cause of this language change as coming from the administration. Language in the catalog allowing students to complete majors appeared contradictory. Additionally, language was proposed making clear that the GPA in minors has to be 2.0.

Proposed language is as follows:

B. Policy:

A minor course of study is an additional course of study a student may take to focus interest in an area other than their major. All minors require at least 18 semester hours in a specified program of study which may be offered within one department or across several departments. Students must take 50% of the credits for the minor through Clarion University. All minors require a minimum grade point average of 2.00.

A student wishing to add an academic minor to their program must fill out a 'Change of Status' form with the student's academic advisor and obtain approval from the department offering the minor. Students may not minor in his or her major. Students cannot elect to take courses as credit-no-record in their minor. Students may also elect more than one minor course of study.

~~Minors must be declared before the completion of the undergraduate degree. Minors will not be awarded after the degree is awarded with the exception noted below. Satisfactory completion of a minor(s) is shown on the student's academic transcript.~~

Students who received their undergraduate degree from Clarion and return to take additional credits to complete a minor or complete a new minor must complete the requirements for the minor within two years of completion of the bachelor's degree.

Discussion occurred about whether students can reorganize existing credits into a minor, and/or if they can take additional credits. Discussion surrounded the minor wording changes in the last paragraph making it clear that students can come back to complete a minor.

Discussion occurred around minor language changes making it clear that the 2.0 GPA was within the major and/or course of study. This mirrors the language on the degree audit. Final language regarding this was:

All minors require a minimum grade point average of 2.00 in their minor course of study.

Vote called. Ayes unanimous. Motion passed.

iii. Add/Drop Policies.

Specific discussion related to athletes and others who would like grades to be reported a day or so earlier, or the Drop period be extended a day or so. The issue is that an athlete, (similarly for any student) may not be able to compete on a Tuesday if the grades were not reported until Wednesday. Additionally, all students face the problem of enrolling in a class during Winter term, especially, in anticipation of a poor grade. In the event that grades are better than anticipated, the student is then incited to drop the class, but as the Drop date is a day or so into the course, the student is now faced with taking and paying for a class they do not need, or dropping it with a large financial cost.

The committee brought proposed language changes to the above noted issues to Senate to be voted upon. J. Phillips noted that this language was only presented in an advisory capacity. The committee has no power to change policy.

Proposed language is as follows:

The drop/add period for Winter Session be moved to Wednesday at 5pm, providing ample time for all Clarion students to determine whether or not they need to enroll or un-enroll in a Winter Session course.

Discussion centered around separation of Add from Drop, given that these classes are so short. Discussion seemed to conclude that Add/Drop is not under PASSHE control, but our local control.

Because the Drop date was the prime concern, and fit the issue brought up in committee, language keeping Add dates as they currently exist but extending the Drop date to Wednesday is proposed.

Final language voted on was:

The drop period for Winter Session be moved to Wednesday at 5pm, providing ample time for all Clarion students to determine whether or not they need to enroll or un-enroll in a Winter Session course.

Vote called on the change in language. Ayes unanimous. Motion passed.

Vote called on the policy recommendation. Ayes unanimous. Motion passed.

iv. AIP changes

J. Phillips noted that AIPs have two functions. Getting student into good standing, and showing regulators that CUP is not bilking student out of financial aid, or making them take on more aid without anything to show. Thus, the Academic Standards Committee discussed the situations in which some students have stated in their AIP that they will earn a 1.0 in the coming semester. This offended the sensibilities of many on the Academic Standards Committee. The rationale for the change is to ensure that students explicitly realize that they must get a 2.0 cumulative GPA within three semesters and that they set semester goals for themselves that have a chance of helping them hit such a goal. It is also to ensure that students and faculty do not set a semester goal of a 1.0 on the form, which is compatible with current language on the form, as that would

make it extremely unlikely that they ever get to a 2.0 and achieve good academic standing. The committee proposed altering the language in part of the student agreement on the AIP to:

I will set target grades for each of my courses that will result in a 2.0 or higher semester GPA.

I will have up to three semesters to raise my overall GPA to a 2.0 or I may lose eligibility for federal financial aid.

Senate determined that language on the back of the AIP made the second statement clear enough to not be needed in a separate location on the AIP.

Thus, the second line was stricken, and a vote was taken on the following addition to the AIP:

I will set target grades for each of my courses that will result in a 2.0 or higher semester GPA.

Vote: Unanimous Ayes. Motion passed.

B. Provost Search Committee/Haines Memorandum

J. Lyle said that the list of potential committee members was extensive. However, upon checking, one of the nominees was not actually faculty, and would be replaced. If the Senate decided to appoint four or five members, the replacement was moot. Only if the Senate wanted 6 appointments to the committee would he need to consult with CCR to replace the 6th member.

J. Lyle outlined the process whereby the list goes to Policy and then to Senate. B. Sweet reminded the Senate that Haines required the names to go to the President first, before going to Policy and Senate. This prevents the public knowledge of lack of presidential backing for a particular committee member. P. Fackler said he trusted the Senate to come up with good names, and was not interested in needing to see them and approve them. His own appointments would be made in light of Senate appointments.

J. Phillips suggested that if the committee will be 'overstacked' with administration appointees, that Senate commit to 4 appointees, arguing for logistical and efficiency reasons. J. Phillips reiterated the need for an explicit written policy going to the Trustees, to provide guidance for future searches. J. Phillips argued for agreeing to a smaller Senate appointment, in light of the President's report and that discussion. He noted that voting could be done via email. S. Boyden agreed. J. Phillips noted the bad emotional relationship the faculty has been in with respect to policies, and so argued for the need for an explicit policy. He argued that we can do work now, knowing what we expect the policy will be, but do not need a full policy now, for this vote.

D. Lott asked if the new policy would have to be voted on prior to appointing anyone to the search committee. J. Phillips noted that, while any decision made now was ad-hoc, but that time considerations dictated quick action. Additionally, Senate can do almost anything on an ad-hoc basis, so long it is known to be ad-hoc, and that it was a stop-gap measure based on a general understanding of what the new policy was to be. J. Phillips argued that there was no need for Senate to write alterations to Haines, vote, and present to the Trustees prior to being able to vote on committee membership, given the general support of the president's desire for a smaller committee. J. Phillips suggested that voting could occur via email.

Discussion followed on the process for appointing members, and how many Faculty Senate would appoint. General discussion seemed to support the argument of the dated-ness of Haines, and the body seemed willing to consider a smaller committee, with Senate appointing 4 members.

A. Roberts summarized the general consensus of the body in support of Senate nominating 4 members to the Provost Search Committee.

D. Clark warned that a new written policy is no guarantee that future presidents or provosts will not follow it.

J. Lyle reminded the body that there was some logic in the original Haines Memorandum regarding 6 committee members. There were several colleges, the library, plus Venango, and non-faculty staff, and other groups, which summed up to 6 units that were to be represented on the committee. While this particular group of volunteers allowed CCR to come up with 4 nominees that seemed to cover the diversity of the university community, in the way that 6 members did in the past, but that future nominees may not be so broad and/or diverse. All agreed that the committee, whatever its make-up, should aspire to diversity in terms of departments, colleges, and university units, as well as with respect to gender and ethnicity.

J. Phillips suggested that language could be inserted into the new agreement to aspire to diversity, etc.

A. Roberts asked P. Fackler if there was a commitment to alter the written policy. P. Fackler said he was so committed.

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