**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on April 25, 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, J. O’Donnell, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, B. Sweet, E. Sauvage-Callaghan, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. E. Foster, R. Gonzales, D. Knepp, R. Lane, B. O’Neil, K. McIntyre, T. Pfannestiel, T. Taylor, and K. Whitney were also present.

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

II. Approval of the Minutes (April 11, 2016) – B. Frakes motioned (Y. Ayad seconded) approval of the minutes. D. Clark asked that the Academic Standards section be revised to indicate the J. Croskey asked about winter add/drop not financial aid. J. Lyle made the change. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

J. Croskey began by welcoming the new senators attending the meeting.

Dr.’s Gent and Fenske would appreciate faculty volunteers for a Committee on Student Retention.

J. Croskey noted that the online graduation application process is in development.

J Croskey thanked everyone for supporting the various academic excellence efforts across campus.

IV. President’s Report – K. Whitney

K. Whitney began by giving kudos to those folks who do academic excellence stuff. She stated that it reminds us of the talent at Clarion and demonstrates the strong relationships that exist between faculty and students.

K. Whitney remarked that the past Friday they held a planning assessment and improvement day. She thanked everyone for attending. She added that they were giving presenters time to work up hand-outs but they will have all of them online soon and notification sent via email.

K. Whitney noted that T. Pfannestiel would begin as interim provost on May 9th. She thanked folks who reviewed files for the position.

K. Whitney stated that she received names of people interested in serving on the provost search last week. She thanks people for their desire to participate. K. Whitney noted that there would be an effort to try to meet before the end of semester; the goal is to have a person in place for July 1, 2017.

K. Whitney concluded by noting that budget talks began today and go thru tomorrow. She encouraged people to please try and attend at least one of the sessions.

V. Student Senate – B. Hill

B. Hill extended thanks to those who attended the Reinhard Awards and/or Relay for Life. She also thanked Faculty Senate for its support of Student Senate.

VI. Committee Reports.

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet stated that people may recall that we had tabled some proposals. 68-71 are withdrawn. 65 was also tabled (pilot concentration) and needs moved off the table. B. Frakes moved to take 65 off the table; A. Roberts seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Sweet asked T. Taylor if he wanted to speak.

T. Taylor began by noting that Rivadi Air now has the requisite certification and aircraft, that Clarion does not need approval vis-à-vis FAA, and that there is no fuel surcharge due to the presence of veterans in the program. B. Sweet stated that the proposal now has a positive recommendation from CCPS.

R Leary stated he was looking over the training courses in the proposal and wondered which courses were in-air. T. Taylor said that they were anything with the word “flight” in the proposal. R. Leary asked how many hours students would get up in air. T. Taylor said 35-40 per. R. Leary said that it was his understanding that students need 1000 hours for a bachelors and certification required 40. R. Leary asked if students would get the 40. T. Taylor said yes. R. Leary asked who possessed the burden of liability. T. Taylor noted that Clarion does not as we only do bookwork; Rivaldi assumes liability. R. Leary asked if it is possible given deeper pockets for Clarion that we would be held liable. T. Taylor said that anyone can sue anyone. K. Whitney said that Taylor can’t answer that as he is not an attorney and said she’d refer the questions to legal counsel if people want to know the answers. T. Taylor added that Clarion already participates in an associates degree so nothing new is occurring. The only new part is the FAA required education part to help people get jobs with a legacy carrier. Motion passed with R. Leary in opposition.

B. Sweet moved to proposals 110-121 (changes to the doctorate in nursing). He noted that the proposals were being tsken out of cycle due to Edinboro and that the proposals come with a positive recommendation. B. Frakes asked if there was a rule on the number of minimum credits for a doctorate. K Whitney and B. Sweet both said no. J. Heard asked if this was a post-masters program. K. Whitney said yes. H. Luthin asked why decrease the overall number of credits – seems like more is better. K. Whitney and R. Gonzales stated that this is not nurse training but leadership credits and in this area there’s a range 26-30. We’re currently at 34 so a reduction makes Clarion more competitive. B. Frakes asked what the number enrolled now was. K. Whitney said 9. She added that the preferred number was 10. J. Phillips asked how this works with Edinboro (in terms of process – is it their decision and we follow). K. Whitney noted that it’s kind of their decision and we’re following; the status quo is not as collegial as desired. We are the administrative site and most of the faculty are at Edinboro. R. Gonzales noted that we are working to resolve the inter-university split. Motion passed unanimously.

B. Sweet moved to 122-123. He noted that these are also out of cycle due to a PASSHE recommendation for new prefix. B. Sweet stated that M. Lepore will represent the department if people have questions. P. Wooodburne asked if the recommendation is just for these courses or all rehab courses. M. Lepore said it is just these. A. Roberts asked why the change. M. Lepore said it is just beneficial to the brand and brings Clarion in line with the other programs in the state regarding the prefix. Motion passes unanimously.

B. Sweet stated that the rest will be dealt with under new and old business.

J. Croskey stated that Senate will debate amongst themselves on the general education proposal. Senators will ask visitors questions if they need specific answers.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

Reinhard Awards were last Wednesday. M. Lepore noted that the committee communicated with S. Fenske to figure out how to promote co-curricular objectives better next year.

C. CCR – J. Phillips

Elections are concluded. CCR has concluded provost search nominations. They had 20 people recommended and narrowed that to 6: Y. Ayad, M. Bridiga, E. Foster, P. Ken, B. Levy, M. Olivas. J. Phillips noted the president accepted the recommendation. This is coming as a recommended slate from committee and needs a vote. Slate passed with unanimous approval.

D. Academic Standards – D. Clark

D. Clark noted that the committee met w P. Gent to discuss AIPs. The committee also is bringing arevised self-disclosure form for athletes. J. Croskey asked if people have questions about the draft. R. Leary said he appreciates the changes but still has issues with civil complaints being posted on this. Leary noted that if a person fails to report and wasn’t there it makes no sense that we could dismiss them from the team. Proposal passed 11-10.

E. Budget – J. Touster

No report

F. Faculty Affairs – L. Taylor

Reminder of the Wednesday retirement reception. They have another retirement, Mike Leroux from history.

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

Facilities Planning met on Thursday. Tippin is the biggest issue – 1st bid failed, 2nd had bid protest, 3rd shot coming. The school is working on scaling back design, hope to bid in the fall, it is not believed impact fall sports but the building might be shut down for 9-12 months.

B. Sweet asked if the pool would close. A. Roberts stated it would be the whole building. P. Woodburne asked where graduation would occur. A. Roberts said Marwick-Boyd. B. Sweet asked how this would impact swim/diving. K. Whitney said that will hire a contractor and work thru the schedule. She noted that there are alternative sites, such as Trader Horn, that may be usable. J. Touster asked what is meant by the Trader Horn comment. K. Whitney remarked that it will be empty so they facility can be used for volleyball. She also said that they are trying to get donors to help get the project done without total closure. B. Sweet asked if the high schools have pools. K. Whitney said no. She identified Brookville, Slippery Rock, and PSU-Dubois as places that might meet specs for intercollegiate swimming at this point. J. Touster asked how does this impact practice. K Whitney said we still need to figure out solutions.

J. Heard asked who is in charge of campus maps and if we can we get a new one. Y. Ayad said we are about to print new maps.

A. Roberts said a question came up about the access of transgender/unisex bathrooms. He noted that there are more of these than thought: Tippin, Becht, plan by Rec pool, coming in Gemmell, one in each of Suites. He added that after this semester they will be discussing signage and suggesting we convert single-stall bathrooms. J. O’Donnell said one in Becker could be. K. Whitney said one in Marwick-Boyd could be.

Y. Ayad added to this is the question by noting the lack of single-stall showers in Gemmell and Tippin.

H. Venango – J. May

Some task-forces were mentioned earlier in the semester and their reports coming to Dr. Gonzales. The Venango committee is looking forward to the Excellence dinner coming on Thursday.

VII. Old Business

1. Self-disclosure statement for athletics – dealt with above
2. General Education Proposal

R. Leary started with concerns and problems identified two meetings ago. First he said he thinks the process is backwards – assessment needs to occur first. Second, as relates to assessment, he recalled the development of gen ed and the adoption of flags. There were too many and the process was unwieldy; thinks it may be hard to assess due to logistical and political difficulties. R. Leary referenced the comment when B Hill said students want to know what will be assessed and noted that is a problem. He suggested students will expect content X and then ask why things are (not) being included in a course which risks misunderstanding.

P. Woodburne said that the when the 16 outcomes were adopted, they may have been state of the art but not now. Things are not being assessed now and it would be nice to have a discussion of how to assess.

H. Luthin said that on the content point there is nothing in the proposal that says how we change and structure courses and added that the one flag per course plan risks teaching to the flag against other learning outcomes.

J Heard said he knows problems with I-flags now, and added that this seems to magnify those existing concerns.

D. Lott asked if flags get waived for transfer students why couldn’t we do this to solve confusion. B. Frakes then asked if flags waived.

J. Lyle said that he went thru the prior minutes and found many arguments against the proposal had not been refuted. He began by listing the arguments in favor of the proposal: it meets the needs of the 21st century student, it fulfills the demands of Middle States (it’s a responsibility to them, it fulfills the skills of Middle States standards), it’s key to assessment, it’s important for recruitment and retention. Lyle then noted the arguments against the proposal: it is too hard for a student to complete the requirements in a timely manner without causing trade-offs and/or sub form overload, it risks political pandering, assessment first is a better alternative, it risks a recertification mess, and it may actually upset Middle States because it looks like we are starting over. J. Lyle then noted that there were several counters to the supporting positions. Goal sacrifice, devaluation of integrated learning, and devaluation of non-scientific outcomes and programs, and uncertainty that the proposal actually changes courses if needed stand against the 21st century student claim. Against the Middle States claim Lyle noted that people claimed Middle States does not actually require changing the gen ed program. Against the “key to assessment” argument Lyle stated that the proposal does not mandate assessment. And against the recruitment/retention claim he pointed out it was argued that there is no reason to believe students actually care about the gen ed program. J. Lyle then noted that the responses to the oppositional claims were lacking. Against the timely completion objection, it was said that majors could build essentials in but it was argued that this was not possible for all of the programs and that policy shouldn’t be based on hoped for solutions. Against the assessment “counterplan” it was argued that the gen ed proposal creates categories for assessment and that there is a need for a stick. J. Lyle pointed out that it was claimed that these categories could be used without changing flags/essentials and that people argued there is a lack of administrative stability to ensure a functioning stick. Furthermore, he noted that people effectively argued that the senate-based committee can function as the stick. In response to the recertification claims it was argued that programs pick what courses meet various essentials on their own, the proposal ensures classes are taught as intended, and that CCPS would do recertification. J. Lyle identified arguments that self-selection renders the plan hollow, the “taught as intended” argument only holds if there is an assessment/enforcement mechanism, and that CCPS is not an assessment body.

D. Lott said he is confused because there are those who say we do not do assessment, and others say we do assessment. Based on this he is not sure why Middle States put us on warning. It seems we are not doing assessment. J. Touster said it seems like administration has the stick, so if people are not acting now then they can do something to ensure assessment. P. Woodburne said but someone’s got to do it.

B. Frakes said he was on steering committee with C. McAleer and remarked that while there are some silos of assessment there is no gen ed assessment piece. He added there were some statements there needs to be will from above to ensure assessment occurs. D. Lott said there are suggestions we rely on administration to make sure but they may not mandate it.

H. Luthin noted that ultimately this is his biggest problem with what is before us. It seems to be a mandate for assessment with lots of content changes that are not really that different – because assessment is the primary impetus there should be something about what the assessment is and how it will be done.

J. May said she thinks we are failing to recognize the role of ISLAC. The inquiry seminars prove there is a need for more assessment and this ties into what C. McAleer said before: assess now and allow that process to ripen. H. Luthin said we just don’t know much about ISLAC and its work is not here in the proposal either so we need to know what is there before we do anything.

S. Prezzano said her concern is the lack of information about each of the essentials – what each entails – and said there needs to be a deeper understanding of what they mean. J. Touster said that he thinks there are good ideas in the essentials proposal but fears wiping away the status quo and adopting a new program risks real problems.

J. Croskey asked if there were additional comments. Silence.

B. Sweet called the question.

K. Whitney asked if we can request a paper ballot. R. Leary said there is nothing as of now that requires a paper ballot.

M. Lepore and E. Sauvage-Callaghan favor paper ballot. D. Clark said a paper ballot contrary to anything we have done in the past and asked if there is a rationale. K. Whitney stated this has been a long process, the GEC has worked for years and CCPS voted for the proposal, so she wants collegiality. D. Clark asked if people should know how we vote and represent them. B. Sweet does not recall using paper ballot for CCPS proposals before; he really only remembered using paper ballots on contested elections. The vote to have a paper ballot passed 12-8.

D. Lott responded to D. Clark by noting that a majority of the folks in the questionnaire supported the proposal so people should represent the will of the larger faculty. B. Frakes, J. Phillips, and S. Prezzano stated that they did not agree with that interpretation of the survey data. J. Phillips added that we all try to represent all of the faculty but noted that we have to vote our conscious.

R. Leary took a moment to clarify what the ballots would mean; “yes” was a vote for adopting the Gen Ed proposal, “no” constituted a vote against the proposal. The ballots were collected and CCR tabulated the results. The proposal failed (18 against - 2 for).

B. Sweet stated that he suspected this would be the result of the vote. He noted that CCPS did make some recommendations that may have altered the outcome of the vote and therefore offered some of those suggestions to revive the effort to assess the general education curriculum (attached). B. Sweet distributed the document and walked thru it.

K. Whitney asked if J. Croskey or B. Sweet would be speaking to the General Education Council to explain why this was defeated? J. Croskey said yes.

B. Frakes asked if we can vote on any of these recs now? B. Sweet said that they’re just recommendations so he thought we could. L. Taylor suggested that this needs to be taken back to the departments. D. Clark noted that there are major curricular implications. P. Woodburn stated that if we voted in minutes on something that took 6 years to develop that would be insulting. A. Roberts noted that this doesn’t this need to go thru CCPS and would be done by an ad hoc committee. R. Leary motioned that we take up the proposal at beginning of the next academic year and encourage CCPS to consider it as well. A. Roberts seconded Leary’s motion. P. Woodburne noted that we can’t create an ad-hoc committee until new by-laws are adopted. R. Leary stated that this is correct but added that senate could look at it directly. B. Sweet noted that CCPS can also look at the proposal. The motion passed unanimously.

J. Lyle noted that while the Gen Ed proposal did not pass there is no reason to not acknowledge the amount of time dedicated to the subject by both the Gen Ed Council and CCPS to the subject and their efforts in advancing the cause of assessing the Gen Ed program at the university. J. Lyle and J. Phillips (seconded) motioned that Senate pass the following statement expressing this:

*Be it resolved that we the members of Faculty Senate thank the past and present members of the General Education Council and the Committee on Courses and Programs of Study for their hard work and commitment to Clarion University in their evaluation of the general education program and the role they have plAyad in advancing the cause of assessment and general education at the institution.*

P. Woodburne stated that he appreciated the sentiment. The motion unanimously passed.

VIII. New Business

1. CCPS read-ins – B. Sweet noted that he sent out the list of read-ins as well as “read-outs” to have courses deleted because they are no longer offered. A. Roberts asked who submitted the proposal to rescind courses. B. Sweet indicated that it began with the provost and noted that he was unable to locate a history regarding how to do this. B. Sweet recommended that departments do this as their own proposal(s) in the future.

IX. Adjournment – A. Roberts moved (B. Frakes seconded). Unanimous passage.

ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

TO BE TAKEN ON GENERAL EDUCATION

1. We are halfway through the two-year pilot on the Inquiry Seminars. After next year Faculty Senate will be able to decide if the Inquiry Seminars should be made part of the General Education Program. If they are added to the General Education Program, Faculty Senate could consider eliminating the six credits of General Education Electives to make room for them. These six credits are currently section IV on the checksheet.
2. The current five flags should be redesignated essentials. This redesignation will facilitate the marketing of the General Education Program.
3. The First Year Values Flag focuses on encouraging students “to become more tolerant and respectful of diversity and to develop those attitudes necessary for them to be successful participants in a global society” and should be redesignated the Diversity Essential.
4. The Second Year Values Flag focuses on “value judgments that are implicit within an academic discipline” and should be redesignated the Professional Ethics Essential.
5. It is recommended that every program that has not already identified a capstone experience should identify one in fall 2016.
6. In fall 2016 Faculty Senate should immediately take up the task of developing and implementing an Oral Communication Essential. What exactly an Oral communication Essential will entail must be more thoroughly defined along the lines of the definitions provided for the current V, S, Q, W, and I flags in the existing General Education documents.
7. It is recommended that Faculty Senate in early fall 2016 examine the possible removal of all courses with more than one prerequisite (with the exception of mathematics courses) from the list of General Education offerings.
8. It is recommended that in early fall 2016 that all programs develop assessment plans for General Education courses to be offered in summer/fall 2017. It is recommended that in early spring 2017 that all programs develop assessment plans for General Education courses to be offered in winter 2017 and spring 2018. Furthermore, it is recommended that programs coordinate the development of these assessment plans with ISLAC or with whatever entity is tasked with assessing General Education.