**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on April 11, 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. G. Cleary, S. Fenske, P. Frese, P. Gent, B. Hill, C. McCarrick, K. McIntyre, B. O’Neil, T. Pfannestiel, K. Roth, and K. Whitney 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 C. McAleer seconded the motion to approve the minutes from March 28th. 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.

Committee on Student Retention – P. Gent and S. Fenske are looking for volunteers. If people are interested they should email J. Croskey, S. Fenske, or P. Gent.

Online graduation application – Is in development. L. Hepler sent out an email; the registrar is trying to streamline the application process.

Movies & Speaker – E. Sauvage-Callaghan mentioned that there are a pair of movies in theater this week including Life Is Beautiful. She also noted that there was a speaker coming on Thursday to Hart. Information on all of the events was sent via email. J. Croskey added that Fed Up (movie) was being shown next Monday (4/18).

Undergraduate Research Conference – S. Prezzano encouraged people to attend the URC on 4/21 in the Gemmell MPR between 10am-2pm. There are over 100 posters being shown. S. Prezzano noted that impact faculty members can have on the student presenters by coming and talking to the presenters.

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

**V. Student Senate – B. Hill**

B. Hill thanked senators for their support of the Pittsburgh Popcorn fundraiser. Over $500 was raised. B. Hill added that applications are available for people to join Student Senate. B. Hill noted that the Reinhard Awards are coming up next week.

K. Whitney gave a shout out to B. Hill and other students who went to Harrisburg with the president to push for enhanced funding for Clarion. K. Whitney noted it was time well spent and suggested it shows the strength of the state schools when students get a chance to get involved like that.

**VI. Committee Reports.**

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet presented proposals for a vote by Senate. B. Sweet stated that proposals 001-107 would be under consideration first. He pulled Gen Ed proposals and proposals that had not received a positive recommendation from CCPS from immediate consideration. P. Gent noted that proposals 68-71, which award credit for non-Clarion coursework, are set to be revised. B. Sweet stated that he was concerned that a vote today would result in rejection and kill the proposals for the semester. K. Whitney asked if the proposals could be tabled and revisited at the final meeting. B. Sweet stated that he was not sure if the proposals would be revised by then. D. Lott asked if the revision meeting is set for Tuesday would there be enough time. B. Sweet said there would be but noted that the clock is running. A. Roberts motions, B. Frakes seconded, that Senate table proposals 68-71. The motion passed with unanimous support.

B. Sweet stated that this means the four Gen Ed proposals and 65 are to be set aside and then asked if there are proposals people want to talk about. R. Leary indicated that he wanted to discuss those proposals as well as 64. B. Sweet set 64 aside.

B. Sweet then stated that all proposal not set aside for discussion are on the table with a positive recommendation from CCPS. The proposals on the table passed (unanimous).

B. Sweet then moved into a discussion of proposal 65, the professional pilot program. He began by noting that the program was approved last year by CCPS and Senate but failed to get to thru the PASSHE. He said that CCPS was concerned why this occurred and what had changed. P. Gent noted that 64 moves from adoption of a major to establishing a concentration within the Applied Technology program. She added that the PASSHE had questions about the reliability of the partner and noted that we would have to get certified. K. Whitney conceded that these were things that probably should have been explored before program consideration; she added that the program could be left within liberal studies. B. Sweet stated that CCPS wondered if there was a concern in labeling the program as a concentration given the number of credits involved (60). S. Boyden asked why the program was being placed in Applied Tech. K. Whitney and P. Gent stated that this gives Clarion time to develop the program and address concerns held by the PASSHE about the perceived lack of resources to execute the program. K. Whitney asked why CCPS flipped from supporting the major to giving a negative recommendation to the concentration. B. Sweet said the program looks identical to the major and there was concern that the program does not constitute a “concentration.” B. Sweet also noted that there was concern the PASSHE would prevent the program from going forward again. It was asked if the proposal could be tabled to allow for discovery of answers to these questions. B. Sweet reiterated the concern about time but said yes. A. Roberts asked if the department was present at the CCPS hearings and if they were notified of the negative recommendation. B. Sweet said yes. D. Lott said that there was no conference between the faculty, chair, and dean on reconciling issues because they did not know there was going to be an opportunity to use a meeting to resolve concerns by tabling the proposal. A. Roberts asked if the credits exceeded the number for a concentration. D. Lott said he did not know because that is not his area of expertise. Y. Ayad asked why all of the courses are numbered “299” and “399”. D. Lott indicated that is the model the program inherited from other initiatives that rely on activity beyond the confines of the university for awarding credits. A. Roberts asked what the transcript would say about the nature of each course. D. Lott said he would need to see a transcript. B. Frakes asked if there was a rule on concentration credits. B. Sweet said the only rule is a minimum of 12. J. Heard said there is a maximum of 42/60 for a BA/BS. C. McAleer stated that she would like an opportunity to vote on the proposal and that she was not sure how it would hurt to table the proposal until the final meeting. S. Boyden stated that she would like to know if the PASSHE questions had been resolved because it is not right to start admitting students if there are remaining questions that could jeopardize the program in the future. K. Whitney said she would like to defer to the relevant persons who know the details. J. Touster asked why the program seems to simply be retitled from the previous year. K. Whitney said that she couldn’t answer that and that she didn’t know the level of engagement by Tim with the chair and/or dean. D. Lott said that he thought the coursework was the result of requirements by the FAA. D. Lott stated that Tim had planned on attending the current senate meeting but that his wife was injured and that he couldn’t make it. C. McAleer moved, B. Frakes seconded, to table the proposal. Motion passed with R. Leary in opposition.

R. Leary asked about proposal 64. He noted that the proposal increases the number of courses a student can take as Applied Tech and stated that there seems to be a concern because anything and everything can fit under a “299” or “399” designation. He followed by asking the purpose of relying on the placeholders. B. Sweet noted that we have used the system with other programs. D. Lott stated that students do work at other accredited institutions and then the return and earn credits at Clarion under those numbers. D. Clark asked how the registrar sorts things out if a student switches from one Applied Tech program to another. D. Lott stated that he thought there were names attached to each specific use of the number that the registrar would see and then be able to act on. C. McAleer agreed with D. Lott’s name argument and stated that she recalled seeing course names on transcripts in the past. K. Whitney offered to have relevant deans and chairs come in and explain the system for the senate if desired. R. Leary suggested that it would have been ideal for persons to be here today given that notice of concern went out. D. Clark asked if programs will be impacted if 64 is rejected. D. Lott said they would. J. Croskey called a vote on 64; the proposal passed with A. Roberts and R. Leary in opposition.

B. Sweet put the Gen Ed proposals on the floor (flag proposals not 108) and stated that CCPS gives them positive recommendations. A. Roberts said that he thought there were no writing-flag courses in English. R. Leary stated that this was a literature course not a writing course. B. Sweet called the question. Motions passed unanimously.

B. Sweet stated that he will have a read-in.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore said that S. Hoke asked for the committee’s input on awards for the Reinhard Awards to be held on the 20th.

C. CCR – J. Phillips

J. Phillips stated that a sign-up sheet is going around or the election on the 19th. He noted that we only need one senator per shift. J. Phillips added that the ballot is going out; there are 16 candidates with 8 to be elected. The candidates are as follows: Yasser Ayad, Carey Childers, Daniel Clark, Duane Farnsworth, Ellen Foster, Jacqueline Knaust, Doug Knepp, Amanda Lockwood, Eric Lewis, Cahndice Matthews, John McCullough, Kathleen McIntyre, Adam Roberts, Annette Rosati, Karl Sprenger, Lorie Taylor.

D. Academic Standards – D. Clark

D. Clark introduced two proposals that come from the Athletic Subcommittee. The first governs athlete participation in non-profit activity and comes from the NCAA. The second is a call for a self-disclosure form. Discussion about the second emerged. R. Leary asked what “complaint” means and stated that this could be a problem if the meaning is too open-ended because coaches could weaponized the form to unjustly remove people from the team. M. Lepore stated that there were language issues. J. Touster asked if this was NCAA language. S. Fenske said that this was not NCAA language but an in-house effort to get ahead of trouble. S. Fenske added that there are some schools in the conference that are concerned; she also added that the document had been reviewed by Clarion’s legal counsel. D. Clark asked if people want him to take the document back to the subcommittee and find out what these things mean. R. Leary said yes. K. Whitney stated that the idea is not to develop an instrument that impacts participation but ensures the school knows what is going on. A. Roberts said he has an issue with singling out athletes; it creates a sense of guilty until proven innocent.

J. Croskey moved to the first proposal. He stated that there is no need for a motion as it comes with favorable review from the committee. Motion passed with P. Woodburne opposing.

D. Clark added that the committee will be meeting to discuss AIPs. J. Croskey asked if there is a financial aid review question. D. Clark said that W. Snodgrass and D. Kadis are working on a document but there is nothing at this point.

E. Budget – J. Touster – no report

F. Faculty Affairs – L. Taylor

L. Taylor stated that there are six retirees. Reception is scheduled for the 27th.

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts – no report

H. Venango – J. May – no report

**VII. Old Business**

1. Constitution & By-laws Issues
   1. Existing by-laws motion

J. Croskey stated that there is a motion of the floor from the previous meeting to change Articles III and X (“president’s designee”, “and the president”). J. Croskey said there would be a vote on this and then consideration of the supplemental proposal supported by K. Whitney. R. Leary noted that there needs to be a show of hands to allow a counting of votes. The proposal passed unanimously.

ii. New by-laws proposal

J. Croskey moved to the submission by K. Whitney. R. Leary noted that there needs to be a motion made to allow consideration by the senate. P. Woodburne moved, C. McAleer seconded. R. Leary noted that a vote cannot occur at this point because people need a chance to review. Discussion ensued.

R. Leary stated that he had a problem with all of the suggestions. He said that he did not believe it to be in the best interest of senate to reduce its own power to act on things. R. Leary added that there may be situations where students need the ability to submit action to senate even if this has not as-of-yet occurred. He echoed similar concerns about the athletic committee change. R. Leary added that a move to being a “recommending” body is a reduction in authority. He concluded by stating that general education is not a policy but a program that comes out of the PASSHE.

J. Phillips stated that he was disappointed to receive this proposal on the Friday before the next to last meeting. He voiced similar concerns that the proposals seem to reduce the authority of the senate on all fronts.

P. Woodburne noted that the Academic Standards Committee change seems to gut 90% of the committee does. D. Clark stated that the use of AIPs is the reason. J. Phillips remarked that commitment to precedent if bad is not an acceptable argument to sustain a line of argument.

H. Luthin said he was concerned with the program versus policy change. He said that general education is curricular which means faculty are part of the resolution and the change seems to remove senate from the equation.

J. Croskey asked K. Whitney if she wanted to speak. K. Whitney stated that she is concerned with how long state APSCUF took to change the constitution and by-laws. She noted that she acted quickly, and in good faith, on the constitution. Review of the by-laws took time. She noted that odds are we are not going to agree on everything but that she is acting in the spirit of fixing as much of the by-laws as possible. As far as general education goes there is a policy from the PASSHE which we will use to construct a policy for general education here. She stated that as far as the assessment committee goes the committee cannot be the only recommending/advising authority as it relates to Middle States, particularly standard #12.

S. Boyden asked if senate authority precludes administrative assessment. K. Whitney said she is read the document at face value. S. Boyden said there may be a middle ground. C. McAleer said she thinks there is concern with the current ability to assess but stated that senate doesn’t have authority to mandate assessment because faculty cannot tell other faculty what to do. A. Roberts indicated that this is particular to general education assessment and said that management cannot do it either. A. Roberts said we need to close the loop which means there must be a faculty role. C. McAleer added that management can order people to do it.

J. Phillips took umbrage with the timing articulation. He noted that senate passed changes and stated that the administration did not submit the changes to the PASSHE for final approval until January. He indicated that could have been discussing this since January. J. Phillips followed that by stating that even if we set that aside he is not sure what the problem is with the assessment committee as it has the same lack of authority as everyone else involved in assessment. He noted that senate needs to assure assessment occurs by being the reporting mechanism, especially since changes to the CCPS manual means that the General Education Council no longer exists. J. Philips said that the notion that faculty senate sits separate from the rest of the university is false and remarked that senate comes from the Trustees. J. Phillips said that the continuity of senate makes is an ideal assessment body for an assessment mechanism. He then discussed the history assessment that he has observed at Clarion and said the problem is that there is never someone to close the loop. He agreed that there will be a need to work with others, such as ISLAC, but stated that there is a need for reports to come here and be reported and recorded. Given that the General Education Council is no more, and that assessment was not their prerogative, J. Phillip said he was not sure why there was resistance to ensuring sunshine is cast on assessment activity thru the senate.

B. Sweet took up the “APSCUF delay” argument. K. Whitney clarified State Meet & Discuss was the key barrier not APSCUF. B. Sweet stated that at the September Meet & Discuss meeting R. Noqaczyk stated that the General Education Council would be removed and that that in October T. Fogarty and E. MacDaniel agreed to move forward. B. Sweet added he is not sure why the proposal was held then until January 29th and suggested that he thought the process may be the problem not APSCUF.

A. Roberts said that we have a motion on the floor to accept the president’s recommendations and added that it sounds like the real problem is with the assessment committee. He asked if we can modify the proposal and vote next time. R. Leary indicated that we cannot vote now. R. Leary followed up by noting that this is all new ground so senate needs to decide what and how amendments can proceed. R. Leary stated that the easiest solution was to amend now and vote in two weeks. J. Lyle asked if any changes need to be agreed to by P. Woodburne as “friendly amendments” given the current motion on the floor. H. Luthin moved that we attempt to come to new language. P. Wodburne suggest that he was willing to remove the motion and take the proposals up separately. K. Whitney said she was willing to remove the changes on page 6 to the Academic Standards and Athletics subcommittees. P. Woodburne removed the original motion and stated that this seems to be a quagmire. J. Phillips suggested that we end the conversation given the need to address general education and the number of people waiting patiently for that discussion.

b. General Education Proposal

J. Croskey asked if there were additional questions about the proposal.

J. Aaron asked a question about the recertification process. She asked how advisers are to plan and act if course eligibility can change during the cycle. P. Gent said that people can go to the registrar’s site and see what is deemed gen ed and look to the calendar to ensure applicability. B. O’Neil said that is not the intent of the Gen Ed Council to cause a certification crisis. Programs will get to decide what counts, the Gen Ed Council won’t evaluate the program and make the changes. J. Aaron said she understand the intent but said she is concerned with the language. B. O’Neil asked if there is alternative language. H. Luthin suggested a change to “review” from “recertification”. D. Lott asked what the mechanism is if a program is not meeting their assessment obligations. He added that the recertification process creates a mechanism that forces participation.

D. Clark said that his concern was kind of the opposite. He wondered how that given CCPS and the Gen Ed Assessment Committee we could give this committee authority to review. D. Lott said that the Gen Ed Council does not get power and that things go back thru CCPS. D. Clark stated that CCPS is a curricular, not an assessment, body.

K. Whitney said but isn’t it the purpose of assessment to take information and use it to improve what we do. She asked how we improve if we do not assess. D. Clark agreed that there is a need to assess and said that is distinct from gen ed reform. H. Luthin followed up on the comments by noting that assessment is good but suggested that we need to do it as a separate activity unless there is a specific need for general education assessment. H. Luthin suggested a move to decertification instead of recertification.

J. Phillips said that D. Lott is speaking to the need for a stick and suggested that the reason for the lack of a stick is because there is no real focus by an entity on doing assessment. He noted that ISLAC is getting data but offered the argument that if it had done so in a more concerted manner the missing evidence would exist.

B. O’Neil then introduced the members of the committee that were present. She followed that by suggesting that perhaps faculty senate could amend and adjust the document. She then spoke to the concerns voiced at the prior meeting. Regarding the “why do this” question, she said that the history of the proposal is useful. She said that the committee was doing Middle States stuff and started to look at how reform could be used for recruitment and retention. As those questions were dealt with the advisory role of the Council expanded. The Council asked what a 21st century student looks like and how gen ed addresses that. She noted that the Council has looked at other schools and has done major investigation. Regarding the essentials she noted that this was not an easy decision and the result of much discussion. She said that the committee just got to a point where they had to advance a proposal and felt that the 10 essential were reflective of what a 21st century student should look like. On assessment, she said that the Council did not address this and stated that she feels this comes next.

J. Touster asked if general education can really help with recruiting. He noted that it may be interesting to know the institution is accredited but suggested that it is probably not a key issue for potential students. B. O’Neil said that the skills development was important to recruiting.

D. Lott spoke and said that we use to have 14 outcomes and didn’t assess which got us to the point we reached with Middle States. J. Phillips stated that this was due to the lack of assessment. D. Lott noted that the lack of assessment was frustrating because people do not volunteer data. J. Phillips agreed but suggested that we need to keep asking and develop a consistent structure. J. Phillips followed up by noting that a consistent administrative presence was important and specifically identified the lack of a stable provost as an issue. K. McIntyre suggested that this is the best proposal for now and said there may be a need to revise the document going forward.

**VIII. New Business**

1. S. Fenske Report [note: S. Fenske spoke after the President’s Report] – S. Fenske introduced herself as the VP of Student Affairs. She has been at Clarion for 9 months and is busy trying to educate folks on what Student Affairs is and does. She distributed a pamphlet (Points of Pride) about Student Affairs. She said that she was willing to talk to anyone about Student Affairs and noted that they only get 13% of their money from E&G funds. She said she is willing to come back in the fall, go to departments, and so forth.
2. CCPS – B. Sweet made the read-in and said that others are coming. He added that the CCPS has links to a bunch of documents that may be useful that are otherwise difficult to find.

**IX**. **Adjournment** – B. Sweet moved to adjourn and D. Clark seconded. Motion passed (unanimous).

Respectfully submitted,

Jim Lyle

Faculty Senate Secretary