**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on November 21, 2016 in 246 Gemmell. J Phillips chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, D. Farnsworth, E. Foster, B. Frakes, D. Knepp, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, J. Lyle, C. Matthews, J. May, J. McCullough, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, P. Woodburne. J. **Annadatha,** J. Beale, S. Fenske, R. Feroz, P. Freese, D. Hartley, T. Pfannestiel, R. Raehsler, M. Shaffer, R. Skunda, B. Smith, and T. Taylor were also present.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes (November 7, 2016) – B. Frakes motioned (S. Prezzano seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Provost Search Update – No update at this time.

FPDC Grant Proposals – J. Phillips reminded folks to check their emails about this and said the due date for applications is January 27, 2017.

Happy Thanksgiving Y’all!

IV. President’s Report – T. Pfannestiel

T. Pfannestiel described additional enrollment numbers for the Senate. He said that we are up 31 deposits as compared to this point in time (11-11) last year and added that deposits indicated likely matriculation into the university. He also said that applications completed and sent letters of acceptance (122) are also up. Admissions is working on translating those letters into expected enrollment. The provost said that he would have program enrollment data after the semester was over. T. Pfannestiel then transitioned into a discussion of fall-to-spring enrollment and noted that there is still work to be done in getting current students enrolled for the spring. He broke the yet-to-enroll students into three groups: financially current, less than $250 owed, more than $250 owed. He said that there are between 600-700 students unenrolled for the spring across the three groups. The provost then spoke to the scholarship issues and said that thanks to some consulting work minor changes were made to the program which should improve incoming student yield in terms of SAT/GPA.

J. Lyle asked if there was an update on the VP for Enrollment search; T. Pfannestiel said that the search is running 3-4 weeks behind the provost search and the goal is to have a person in place this summer.

J. Phillips suggested that there seems to be apathy about enrollment for a number of students and asked if there was an explanation for students without holds to not be enrolled yet. T. Pfanestiel said he was not sure why this was the case for some students, and he added that this is something people are trying to figure out. R. Skunda offered that some of his peers are lazy when it comes to getting signed up for classes.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that Student Senate has been a little busy with the recent Social Equity Dinner on the 9th. He said that it went well. He then noted that Senate held a breakfast event to facilitate interaction with the student body; he thought it went well and said that the Senate would explore how to improve such events going forward. R. Skunda remarked that there is finally a student trustee, though the oath still needs to be taken. He concluded the report by mentioning that the Senate is having Wingo (wings & bingo) on 12-3.

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – A. Roberts

A Roberts had read-ins. He thanked the members of CCPS for their work this semester. He thanked the members of the Senate for their work on curricular issues as well.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore said the committee would meet next Monday at 11:30.

C. CCR – E. Foster

No report

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report

E. Budget – C. Childers

No report

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

D. Knepp said the Thanksgiving dinner occurred with a few faculty attending.

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

Facilities Planning met. A. Roberts said that the credit card policy was being changed and added that signage issues are being resolved. He asked folks to let him know if they see signs on campus that are inaccurate. A. Roberts concluded the report by saying that the Tippin project is waiting for approval so it can be sent back out for bids.

H. Venango – J. May

No report.

VII. Old Business

1. By-Laws Status Update – Remains tabled.
2. Letter to the President –

J. Phillips said that he provided K. Whitney with the Senate’s response to her statement from the November 7th meeting. He also said that he read the letter to the Council of Trustees at their recent meeting. J. Overly asked if there was a response from the Council; J. Phillips said no.

J. Overly moved (A. Roberts seconded) to have the letter added to the minutes; motion unanimously passed (letter is attached at the conclusion of these minutes).

J. Lyle motioned that the Senate reaffirm its belief in the leadership of J. Phillips as chair who was directly cited in K. Whitney’s accusations. D. Knepp seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously with huzzahs. The motion read as follows: “Faculty Senate reaffirms its belief in the leadership of its chair, Dr. Jamie Phillips, who has been a strong advocate and leader for Clarion University’s faculty.” J. Phillips thanked the members of the Senate for the sentiment.

VIII. New Business

1. CCPS

A Robert began by stating that there are a couple categories of proposals and noted that a number of proposals have been withdrawn depending on when people last have checked the CCPS website.

Withdrawn proposals include 43 (which is now 151-3), 45, 47, 48, 52, and 118.

Two proposals come forward with negative recommendations (65 and 148).

Proposal 151-153 have no recommendation yet from CCPS. CCPS want additional information before making a decision.

There are three proposals with objections and they have been pulled aside (41-42-76).

The rest come forward with positive recommendations so there is no need for a second to the motion and they are on the floor. J. Phillips said that these positive recommendation proposals will be taken en masse unless they pulled out by a senator. B. Frakes asked to pull 86-122, and R. Leary added 123.

The remaining un-pulled, positive recommendation proposals were approved unanimously.

A Roberts then suggested Senate move to consideration of proposals 86-123. B. Frakes suggested that is a large number of courses seeking 2C placement and asked why some of these are not professional applied courses. R. Leary said that he divided the courses in a couple ways. He noted that 99, 101, 113, and 123 all have 2 pre-requisites so he not sure how they go into that category. As for the rest he said he does not blanket objection but wonder why some (such as 88, but not 86) constitute general education courses instead of applied courses. J. Lyle responded the questions by making several points. First, J. Lyle noted that since he was not the specific author of the proposals he may not speak with total accuracy as to some of the rationale for specific proposals. Second, he said that the general goal is to get COM placed into 2C in ways that many other Arts & Sciences courses exist. He added that there are individual proposals because that is what the former chair of CCPS had previously directed the department to do. Third, J. Lyle noted that the department believes that communication as a discipline is understood as part of the arts and humanities. Fourth, J. Lyle noted that this is also a response to some issues with getting courses placed into 1C and 2B which further reinforced the notion that 2C was where they belong. R. Leary noted that he would have argued that there were reasons to not include them in 2B last year because he thinks there are many courses that are very practical in their make-up so they may not belong in either category. S. Prezzano inquired as to who is the audience for the courses since majors are generally prohibited against using major courses as general education requirements. J. Lyle suggested that the entire campus is the audience because people may want the courses outside of the department. A. Roberts spoke up and offered a fact issue that there is no prohibition on courses with two prerequisites from being placed in general education. He also noted that proposal 87 is not a 2C proposal but a personal performance proposal. J. Phillips said that if the goal is to get Communication recognized as an Arts & Humanities department then there needs to be more people here from Communication and then we can have the conversation. R. Leary said he agrees with that but restated that he does have issues with specific courses. A. Roberts asked how to proceed. R. Leary suggested he wanted to pull out proposals 88, 89, 90, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, and 123. D. Clark asked if it is possible to get Communication to put together a list comparable to English. J. Phillip recommended tabling matters for cleaner proposal and an effort to get more people here. R. Leary motioned (E. Foster seconded) to table table 86-123. Motion was unanimously approved.

A Roberts moved to proposal 65, which comes forward with a negative recommendation. J. Phillips asked why the recommendation is negative. A. Roberts said there is a reluctance to take out stats and added that there is no updated checksheet provided by Nursing. D. Lott stated that he recalled C. McAleer previously suggesting is it problematic to hold people hostage over what their requirements should be. There was some discussion of whether to table the proposal but it was stated that Nursing knew to have someone attending and J. Phillips said he was not going to support tabling everything. J. Phillips then said that Senate was going to vote on whether the proposal would go forward. The proposal failed (4 yes votes to move on).

A Roberts moved to 148 which seeks 2A placement for Managerial Economics. P. Woodburne said that this proposal was made to facilitate placement for courses given things occurring with Economics and COBA. The proposal was unanimously rejected.

A Roberts moved to discuss proposals 41, 42, and 76.

Proposal 42 is for the creation for MATH 132 and is objected to by Economics. A. Roberts noted that folks have the objection write-up in their packet and then asked who would represent Economics. P. Woodburne stated that he can, and noted that R. Raehsler is also here. P. Woodburne reiterated that everyone has the document stating the position of Economics. He remarked that COBAIS wanted to eliminate Economics role in the curriculum by removing ECON 309 but keep the content by placing it in another class. Furthermore, he said the proposal will take material and drop it from a junior level course to sophomore level. P. Woodburne said that Econ was a part of the college at the time but did not take part of the discussions, and added that the book we saw proposed was a managerial economics text. J. Beal then spoke for Mathematics. J. Beal said that the topics listed fall within the purview of Math, that they will not choose a managerial economics book, and that he has rewritten the topics (they are same but give a better flavor of how they fit within the program) which shows that 75% of the course is math and yes it is applied. B. Frakes stated that he feels like he is missing a piece of information and asked about the proposal for having Econ getting moved out of the Business curriculum. A. Roberts said that is the new set of proposals (151-3). D. Clark asked if this displaces an economics class. P. Woodburne said that the plan was to develop a comparable course but added that the department fears this course will chill economics’ ability to do so. A. Roberts interjected by stating that to a certain extent this occurs now. P. Woodburne agreed but suggested that the amount of overlap created between math and economics by the course was different. D. Lott inquired if this will this be the math competency for the program. J. Beal stated that students will take two math courses but either could technically count, but he added that there would be no calculus requirement if this proposal goes thru. R. Leary stated that while he intended no disrespect to his colleagues in Math that he has a hard time getting thru the context where it seems Econ is getting clobbered and added that he fears the proposals are being advanced in an un-collegial manner. J. Beal stated that he would not be willing to speak about the broader picture, but said that if question is whether this is a good course the answer is yes. R. Raehsler noted that he was surprised this proposal got thru CCPS, that he thought there was an obligation to include impacted departments, that he thought there was potential in the idea of the course and felt inclusion in discussions could have led to support for cross-listing the course. R. Raehsler said that what troubles him is not just the ECON 309 impact, though it could make that course superfluous, but that the course has stats content and at a lower level that what is currently offered. A. Roberts then noted that P. Woodburne was at the meeting where the nuts and bolts were hashed out in September; P. Woodburne responded by stating that initial discussions occurred in the months prior and Econ was not a part of the process then. J. Lyle stated that he did not know what was really going on and asked why the departments were not being asked to come together like the relevant departments in the Disability Studies talks during the 2015-2016 year. J. Beal indicated that this stuff is math. R. Raehsler said that timing (in terms of when the course is offered) explains a lot of the differences. D. Clark asked why doesn’t advising solve the problem and then asked if the deans are involved in the discussions (and the administration). B. Smith said they discussed things in September, and admitted that he doesn’t know enough, especially about the economics side of things. B. Smith said he feeling was to defer to Faculty Senate and CCPS because they do know about departmental differences. P. Freese said there appears to be a misunderstanding as to why this occurring. P. Freese said COBA met with other institutions regarding advise to ensure to college can give the best curriculum for its students. J. Phillips said people can vote on the narrow question or the larger question of what the impact is on the programs. B. Frakes motioned to table the proposal until the lower core questions were resolved (J. Croskey seconded). Motion passed.

A Roherts moved to proposals 41 & 76. He noted that Econ claims this is duplicates economics and said that they claim they should get to teach the course. A. Roberts then said that CIS objected to the Econ proposal as a defensive reaction. J. Phillips gave two minutes per side to make their case beyond the written submissions. P. Woodburne went first and said that the course covers everything Econ does and noted that the proposed syllabus uses a business economics book. J. **Annadatha** then spoke and noted that the program was being passed around with no initial takers, added that CIS took it up, and stated that they had no objection to the Econ course. J. **Annadatha** followed this up by stating that CIS thinks this fits their courses and noted that this is the 6th course in their minor. J. **Annadatha** said the courses are not similar as they have different prerequisites. He concluded by stating that CIS didn’t know Econ had created a course.

R. Raehsler spoke up and stated that (1) the CIS course does statistics like economics and (2) the data analytics program was never offered to Economics as a program. R. Raehsler said that the primary objection is that this is Econ’s basic statistics course. J. **Annadatha said that he could not speak to why and how the course got to CIS but noted that** the CIS course works for Business and said that they proposed it in the minor and for graduate courses, which he pointed out had no objections. R. Raehsler said that this would severely cripple economics and suggested an alternative wuld be for the program to require economics. J. **Annadatha** stated that the minor does this as it has a statistics requirement. B. Frakes asked if the deans have opinions. P. Freese stated that COBAIS is trying to do data analytics. P. Freese said that this proposal is from something not being offered so they designed the course, and then noted that psychology has a stats course so Business is working to make it happen in their programs for their students. P. Freese said that they don’t care who teaches the course, they need it and added that offering it would be unique to this region as a course. C. Childers asked if we’ve approved the data analytics program. J. Croskey said as a masters-level course; A. Roberts noted that Senate supported the minor roughly an hour ago in the bulk approval list. B. Smith noted that the content seems similar, and said the question is how often the CIS course is available. J. Phillips called for votes on the proposals. Proposal 41 (Econ) passed unanimously. Proposal 76 (CIS) passed.

1. Susan Fenske & Matt Shaffer – Title IX Presentation

S. Fenske began by stating that she would be using the opportunity to cover a little more than Title IX but added she would be brief. She noted that she shared a version of the document being distributed last year but wanted to show folks the new materials with updated student points of pride. She also provided information with a list of what is new in Student Affairs [retention task force, institutional accreditation standards for non-academics (mirrors ISLAC) and so forth]. She then noted that Student Affairs has a financial prep work group because right now a student receiving full aid still leaves roughly $2000 uncovered. Dr. Fenske then spoke to the sexual misconduct policy which she said ties into Title IX, and noted that she is now the Title IX Coordinator since Dr. Gant has retired. S. Fenske said she is working on how to improve messaging and get stakeholders involved.

S. Fenske then introduced M. Shaffer, who is working on the student misconduct policy, which they hope to get approved at the end of December.

M. Shaffer spoke about changes to the code of conduct. He said that they are splitting the document. The first part is the actual code, which he said will have no real impact on faculty as there are no academic changes. The other part relates to the community. He said he thinks it will be simpler and will give students more ability to interact with the office and reduce conduct board issues. The hope is that the Trustees will look at the document in February. M. Shaffer then said that the other thing he has to share is a document J. Hendershot put together based on a Virginia Tech policy for student referrals. He said that this is a supplement to the document everyone should have received in August.

R. Leary asked if we see behaviors identified in the documents regarding referrals (sleeping in class, cell phone use, etc) if we are expected to refer students. M. Shaffer said it is an option, but suggested that faculty use their discretion. S. Fenske added that if the actions suggest a behavior change on the part of the student then there may be a need for assistance.

D. Clark asked if BART referrals confidential. M. Shaffer said that they can be confidential because there is no need to provide your name on the form. S. Fenske said that the way to think about referrals is that if you have issue that you see that gives you pause then it may be wise to make a referral.

IX. Adjournment – D. Clark moved (J. Overly seconded). Unanimous passage.

From: Clarion University Faculty Senate

To: Dr. Karen Whitney, President, Clarion University of Pennsylvania

Re: President’s Report to Faculty Senate on Monday, November 8, 2016

Date: November 15, 2016

At Faculty Senate’s biweekly meeting on Monday, November 8, you made a statement at the very beginning of our meeting that you would not be attending Faculty Senate anymore because you felt ‘bullied’ by Senators and intimated that Faculty Senate had somehow created a hostile work environment for you due to the negative attitude of senators towards you when you attend meetings. You particularly asserted that you felt disrespected by the Chair of Faculty Senate and that the rest of Faculty Senate were neglectful by-standers to this disrespectful treatment. You then exited the room before a discussion of your accusations against us could transpire.

This letter is written to unequivocally reject your characterization of Faculty Senate’s treatment of you. You have never been bullied either by the Chair of Faculty Senate or by any Senator. While Senators have openly disagreed and expressed frustration with your policies and practices, this is not bullying; rather, it is the open and frank discussion needed for successful governance of this university. It is, in fact, the open and frank dialog that you request in your personal motto “silence is consent.” Senators are morally obligated as part of their duties as senators to question and critique the policies and practices of the Administration. This critique is necessary in order to ensure that all actions taken by the University Administration are fully-informed, appropriately circumspect, and ultimately in the long-term best interest of the University.

Faculty Senate cannot mandate that you attend our meetings and it cannot mandate that you listen, or take into account, any criticisms we have of your managerial style, managerial decisions, or managerial imperatives. But Faculty Senate does reaffirm its right as a Council of Trustees sanctioned governance body to participate in the shared governance of Clarion University of Pennsylvania and reaffirms its right to engage in forthright and respectful dialogue regarding all aspects of university governance falling under its constitutional purview.

Sincerely yours,

Senators,

Ayad, Yasser Childers, Carey Clark, Dan Croskey, Joseph

Farnsworth, Duane Foster, Ellen Frakes, Robert Knepp, Doug

Leary, Ralph Lepore, Mark F. Lockwood, Amanda Lott, David

Lyle, Jim May, Jennifer McCullough, John McIntyre, Kathleen

Overly, Joyce Phillips, Jamie Prezzano, Susan Roberts, Adam

Taylor, Lorie Touster, Jonathan Woodburne, Paul