**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on March 28, 2016 in 146 Gemmell. J Croskey chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: J. Aaron, Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, D. Clark, B. Frakes, S. Harris, J. Heard, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, H. Luthin, J. Lyle, J. May, C. McAleer, J. O’Donnell, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, B. Sweet, E. Sauvage-Callaghan, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. P. Gent, B. Hill, and B. O’Neil were also present.

1. **Call to Order** - J. Croskey called the meeting to order at 3:30 pm.
2. **Approval of Minutes** – B. Frakes moved and A. Roberts seconded the motion to approve the minutes from March 14th. The minutes were approved (unanimous).
3. **Announcements**

Relay for Life – Please support Student Senate in the April 15th Relay for Life Event.

Healthy U – Members can earn points by participating at the Happy, Healthy, & Whole Wellness Fair.

Commencement – Please RSVP participation.

Faculty Senate Nomination Election – J. Phillips distributed a sign-up sheet for people to work the nomination election ballot table.

1. **President’s Report** – K. Whitney – no report

**V. Student Senate – B. Hill**

Popcorn for the Student Senate fundraiser for Owen Bond is coming. French Club is showing Ratatouille.

**VI. Committee Reports.**

 A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet noted that open hearing will be held on Thursday March 30 at 3:30PM. He stated that there is one outstanding objection so the committee will be taking evidence to address and resolve the matter. CCPS did meet last week and discussed the Gen Ed proposal. B. Sweet will have a read-in in new business. A. Roberts and C. McAleer thanked B. Sweet for the clarifications regarding proposals discussed in the previous Senate meeting.

 B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore stated that S. Fenske is planning on coming to Senate on April 11th.

 C. CCR – J. Phillips

J. Phillips stated the nomination election will be on April 5th and the regular election will be on April 19th. Email is forthcoming with the new eligibility list. J. Phillips stated that CCR is working on the provost search committee and that it has been asked to do a search for a new dean at Venango. D. Lott asked if there was new information regarding the interim provost search. J. Phillips and J. Croskey said there was not. C. McAleer noted that the deadline to apply for the interim position is April 1st.

 D. Academic Standards – D. Clark

D. Clark stated that there was no real report beyond noting that the committee did receive a draft of FAQs regarding AIPs to review.

 E. Budget – J. Touster – no report

 F. Faculty Affairs – L. Taylor – no report

 G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

A. Roberts noted that the last meeting was cancelled and that there is still no timeline for Tippin.

 H. Venango – J. May

J. May stated that the search for an associate dean at Venango is coming. She also stated that there has been discussion about breaking up the department of Arts & Sciences and bringing people to the main campus. J. May deferred to D. Lott on the department matter as it is his department but he said he was unable to shed additional light on the matter. R. Leary asked why there was need for an additional dean if the plan is to dissolve a department. J. May said that the break-up is just for Arts & Sciences and added that there has been no clarification regarding the administrative need at this point. C. McAleer added that there has been no decision on the break-up yet and that the deans were discussing the matter. J. O’Donnell asked if this was a new dean position or a replacement. J. Phillips and J. May said it was new. D. Lott added that while it is new the college has had people leave and current positions have been combined so that may be part of the rationale.

**VII. Old Business**

1. Constitution & By-laws Issues
	1. General Education Assessment Committee

J. Croskey noted that Policy members met with K. Whitney to discuss by-law issues. He added that R. Nowaczyk and T. Fogarty were also present at the meeting. He described the meeting as an effort by the president to initiate changes in the by-laws. Some were described as housekeeping (making the by-laws consistent with the constitution) and some were more significant (changing authority and releases); J. Croskey then walked thru the issues identified by K. Whitney.

C. McAleer asked what the process for revision would be. R. Leary indicated that proposals could be introduced at this meeting but then could not be decided until the following meeting. B. Frakes asked if these were whole new changes. R. Leary said they were and added that the existing revisions are still pending. C. McAleer asked if the president could initiate the proposals. R. Leary said the president could but then nothing would go to the Board of Trustees until July. C. McAleer said she would like to see actual language before considering reforms. J. Phillips suggested that we start with a clean motion since the was al just discussion without formal proposals. J. Phillips motioned, and H. Luthin seconded, that we change section 3, article 3 to say “president’s designee” and add “and the president” to Article 10. J. Croskey said he would get the actual changes sent out later for people to see before the next meeting. A. Roberts suggested this was all confusing because the changes already put on the table have yet to be approved. J. Phillips said that the goal is to get everything to the Board in April.

**VIII. New Business**

1. CCPS – B. Sweet read in the numbering change for PSY 331 becoming 320. The proposal aims to line up courses based on age sequencing.
2. General Education Proposal –

J. Croskey began the conversation by thanking everyone who has worked on the proposal and stated his hope that people can come to quick resolution over the issue. He then introduced B. O’Neil and invited her to speak to Senate as the chair of the Gen Ed Council.

B. O’Neil opened by noting that the proposal has been work in progress and the Gen Ed Council has gotten a good bit of feedback regarding ways to develop a general education program that responds to the needs of students in the 21st century. She stated that she feels the proposal is a responsibility to Middle States. B. O’Neil then moved into the highlights of the proposal. She stated that the proposal

1. Moves from “flags” to “essentials” and adds emphasis on skills development based on the Middle States standards that are coming into effect in 2017 and input from the Clarion faculty. She noted that the integration essential is for the capstone course. B. O’Neil stated that the proposal calls for assessment of liberal knowledge and the wellness category and noted that ISLAC has already initiated content assessment which the Gen Ed Council recommends continue. She added that she knows it appears that there is a lot for people to complete, and that the Council recommends departments build essentials into their majors so as to simplify everyone’s ability to complete the process much as we do now with flags. B. O’Neil then stated that the proposal calls for one essential per course, all courses in gen ed must have an essential affiliated with it, and there will be a three-year cycle of assessment of the general education courses.

B. O’Neil then stopped and introduced other members of the council who were present: P. Gent, D. Lott, B. Hill (student), and P. Woodburne (former member of the Gen Ed Council).

B. O’Neil then asked if members of Senate had questions and concerns.

H. Luthin stated the number of essentials required and the one per course limitation seems like it makes it difficult for a student to navigate the 27 credits of liberal education to ensure completion. B. O’Neil responded by saying that this was why the Council was recommending that programs build essentials within their courses. H. Luthin countered by noting that this may be very difficult for some programs as they just don’t have courses that work for specific essentials. Luthin identified the scientific reasoning essential and the ENGL major as a point of incompatibility.

R. Leary picked up on what Luthin said and noted that he was here when the school moved to flags. Leary stated that the flag experience demonstrates that there is a risk of political decisions being levied by departments such that they will use essentials as a tactic to attract students by pandering to ensure enrollment in courses. B. O’Neil said that she understood that concern but still felt that the skills are good for students to get. R. Leary followed up by asking if Middle States required these skill essentials. B. O’Neil said no but that they were pushing skills emphasis and stated that she felt that the use of the essentials was a key mechanism for enabling assessment.

J. Touster asked what mechanism of assessment is provided in the proposal. B. O’Neil stated that the proposal doesn’t include specific mechanisms as it is not the place of the Council to decide. C. McAleer noted that we can assess many courses with a specific mechanism if it works.

L. Taylor asked why the proposal limits courses to being linked to one essential. B. O’Neil stated that this prevents people from being overwhelmed in the implementation process. J. O’Donnell stated that it seems that two could work. H. Luthin added that parceling out one essential per course seems to privilege assessment over learning because an instructor may sacrifice other goals/content to ensure essential fulfillment. B. O’Neil noted that a course can cover many of the essentials but that the limit simply means only one is assessed. B. Hill stated that flags are restricted as well; Luthin responded by noting that there are only 4 flags. H. Luthin also stated that the limit suggests that integration of essentials does not occur until a student’s senior year. B. O’Neil responded by asking why a limit of 2 doesn’t constrain things even more.

D. Clark stated that he was not sure if the purpose of the proposal was curricular or assessment-based. His reaction was that it feels like we just need to do assessment. He was not sure why this was submitted as a curricular proposal.

S. Prezzano asked what the rationale was for having a scientific reasoning essential and not essentials for other forms of reasoning and stated that this seemed problematic in how it emphasizes specific styles of learning. B. O’Neil stated that Middle States mentions scientific reasoning and that the Council’s math representative recognized this need. B. O’Neil stated that this representative polled colleagues and so forth on the matter. J. Phillips commented that (1) ISLAC is indeed doing assessment now, but (2) that he was not sure why all general education courses need a skills essential associated with them.

C. McAleer said she fears a significant risk of sub form overload. She noted that even in the current world there is an issue where the inquiry seminars are being placed by the registrar under the science category because the flag has no other place to fit. She stated that this problem would be magnified and added that this could be problematic for speech path because it would cause trade-offs with science courses. C.McAleer noted that perhaps flexibility could be created to allow information literacy courses to fit under the liberal education skills elective section because it is too limited in the status quo.

J. Lyle inquired about what the problem or need is requiring the proposal to be submitted. He stated that he wasn’t sure why conducting assessment before reforming the curriculum wasn’t possible. J. Lyle said that there seems to be two possible reasons for the proposal: (1) we think our courses are failing students now which means the proposal is designed to force curricular revision or (2) it is a way to establish categories that makes assessment easier to conduct. B. O’Neil indicated that the reason for the proposal was because there had been a call for reform and that the Council felt that it would be easier to conduct assessment in the world of the proposal. J. May also stated that she was not sure why we don’t assess what we have currently without changing general education as currently constituted. J. May also asked what would happen if a student did not complete the 10 essentials before reaching 120 credits.

J. Phillips spoke up to clarify that Faculty Senate did not say that it wanted general education reform. He stated while he knows there is documentation asserting such a claim that he was not sure where that language came from. B. O’Neil noted that the Council’s proposal is an effort to be proactive vis-à-vis Middle States.

J. Aaron inquired about the content in Appendix D. She said that it seems like courses are grandfathered in and then reapproved thru assessment process on the 3 year cycle. B. O’Neil stated that the departments will decide which classes go into general education not the General Education Council. C. McAleer added that the process feels like a book-keeping nightmare. J. Touster noted that removing the word “approve” may help make the proposal seem less scary to folks because it creates uncertainty about what to expect going forward. P. Woodburne said that the merits of the proposal is that this creates a process to ensure classes are taught as intended. He stated everyone knows there are W flag courses that are not taught as intended and said that re-approval helps solve that. J. Touster responded by indicating that this solution is only possible if there is a return to the development of an assessment piece that currently is not part of the proposal.

R. Leary spoke up and suggested that we need to return to the question of need. He stated that we need to assess the courses and then change if called for. R. Leary said that he fears we are closing the loop and acting for the sake of acting. B. O’Neil noted that there some things that we don’t assess now and suggest that the proposal would fix that. C. McAleer expressed concern that reform pre-assessment will be a major issue for Middle States because it will look like we are making changes without grounds. C. McAleer then asked if we can see the results of current assessment efforts. J. Phillips stated he was not sure there is direct assessment now, just indirect assessment.

J. Phillips said that one concern with the proposal was that he was not sure Faculty Senate can mandate classes be created. If the process requires the development of courses then the issue may need to go to Meet & Discuss. He suggested that this is no different than Senate’s inability to tell CCPS to change curricular deadlines. P. Gent then noted that some of this language was in previous general education documents. Both C. McAleer and J. Phillips stated that just because there was an agreement at one time does not mean agreement now. They suggest that there is a need to check with the union on this matter.

C. McAleer reiterated that we need assessment data.

J. O’Donnell asked if this is all just informational or is this coming from CCPS to Faculty Senate for a vote. B. Sweet indicated that the president wants this considered this semester. D. Lott then asked what the CCPS status was. B. Sweet noted that the CCPS vote was 5-2 in favor but suggest that the outcome may not be that simple. CCPS made recommendations to the General Education Council after receiving the proposal, and while Gen Ed made some of the recommendations they did not make all of them.

P. Woodburn asked how the vote would occur. R. Leary said it depends on whether there is a motion to amend the proposal. If there are none then the proposal would be voted up or down as-is. B. Sweet suggested that people may need to read the proposal again given the revisions and decide if we want to amend it or entertain the current version. D. Clark asked if the proposal would go back to the General Education Council. B. Sweet said this was not needed and that Faculty Senate can do revision. B. Frakes asked what happens if the proposal is voted down by Senate. B. Sweet responded by saying that the proposal is then terminated for the semester. D. Lott spoke and stated that there have been several open forums and that the proposal has been out there for consideration. D. Lott noted that the administration has met with people across the university about and that this has been the project for years. He noted added that this is not just a small group trying to force the program onto the rest of the university. D. Lott also said that the Council could not include all the recommendations. H. Luthin spoke up and noted that he felt that this version of the proposal was substantially improved over previous versions.

C. McAleer stated that she feels it would be helpful to have assessment data to use to justify change. D. Lott said that LEAP has studied the inquiry seminars. A. Roberts stated that the inquiry seminars were done to address retention so it should be easy to look at that data.

A Roberts stated that he has a problem with the elimination of the general education elective.

H. Luthin asked if Senate can request existing assessment data. J. Croskey said yes. S. Prezzano asked that there also be evidence of W-Flag reform that was referred to earlier.

**IX**. **Adjournment** – C. McAleer moved to adjourn and H. Luthin seconded. Motion passed (unanimous).

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Lyle

Faculty Senate Secretary