**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

The Faculty Senate met on Monday, September 14, 2015 in Room 246 Gemmell. J. Croskey chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: J. Aaron, Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, D. Clark, R. Frakes, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, H. Luthin, J. Lyle, J. May, C. McAleer, L. Occhipinti. J. O’Donnell, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, E. Sauvage-Callaghan, J. Smrekar, B. Sweet, L. Taylor and J. Touster. B. Hill, E. Green, and K. Whitney were also present.

1. **Call to order –** J.Croskey called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes**

R. Frakes moved and C. McAleer seconded a motion to approve the minutes from August 31, 2014. The minutes were approved.

1. **Announcements**
* Senate observed a moment of silence in memory of Dr. Brian McGuire.
* The Tenth Annual GIS conference will be held October 15-16. Registration is free for faculty and students.
* This week is Meet Your Advisor week.
* There will be meetings this week for faculty interested in creating a new inquiry seminar.
1. **President’s report – K. Whitney**
* The state budget still in a stalemate. K. Whitney will be going to Harrisburg next week.
* Thanks to everyone for their work in putting together Founders Day, which included the employee recognition reception and the open house for the new residence hall. The open house at Becht Hall was this afternoon.
* A meeting was held last Friday, with many exciting ideas, to begin planning for Clarion’s 150th anniversary.

**V. Student Senate Report – E. Green**

- Freshman elections are being held this week.

- A Student Senate retreat is being planned for October.

- B. Hill will also be representing Student Senate at the Faculty Senate meetings.

- The Student Senate secretary is stepping down, and an election will be held to select a new secretary.

1. **Committee reports**
2. **CCPS – B. Sweet –** Proposal deadlines are 9/16 for special topics and experimental courses, and 9/25 for major changes. The objection deadline is 10/16. CCPS will be meeting 10/16 to review proposals, and the open hearings will be on10/28. CCPS will be meeting this Wednesday to look at a resubmitted proposal and the general education proposal that was submitted too late in the spring to consider (on the webpage – proposal # 2015-s-218). The committee will be looking at how to proceed.

Read ins.

1. **Student Affairs – M. Lepore –** This week was very busy for Student Affairs. The committee will be adding new members.
2. **CCR – J. Phillips –** Acall sent out for volunteers for committee slots. The deadline was Friday, but there were few responses. The committee be sending out a second call.

S. Boyden suggested that people who did volunteer should be contacted before they are appointed to multiple committees.

J. Touster asked about the possibility of opening slots to non-tenure track faculty. J. Phillips replied that it is possible that they could serve one year terms if we are still short after another call.

R. Frakes asked if the number of responses was normal. J. Phillips replied that it is much lower than usual.

1. **Academic Standards – D. Clark** – No report
2. **Budget – J. Touster** – No report
3. **Faculty Affairs – L. Taylor** – No report
4. **Institutional Resources – A. Roberts** – The first facilities planning meeting will be on Thursday 9/17.

**H. Venango – J. May –** There will be anopen house this Saturday for incoming students.

1. **Old Business**

**A. Constitution and Bylaws –** B. Sweet reported that at meet and discuss an agreement was reached to change the CCPS procedure manual, but only changes pertaining to the Council on General Education. No other changes to the procedure manual will be sent forward now. The agreed-upon change in language was sent to Senate Policy committee, APSCUF, and T. Fogarty, and will be sent to state meet and discuss.

There was a discussion of timing to have the changes approved by the trustees.

**B. Foundations of Excellence** – P. Gent will come to a future Senate meeting to elaborate on the process. A call has been sent out for volunteers.

**C. Academic standing policy and AIPs** – There is still work being done on this policy. A copy of the AIP template was sent out to senators, as well as links to other models.

S. Boyden asked if there us guidance for faculty advisors, so that plans are consistent and feasible. J. Croskey said that since students have a limited time to bring up their GPA, it is important to use strategies to do that, which can be complicated. He noted that some universities have advisors who work to build a schedule.

S. Prezzano asked if there is a mechanism to know students with AIPs are in a faculty’s classes. J. Croskey said that there is not currently. S. Prezzano said it would be helpful for faculty to know so that they could reach out to those students. There was a discussion.

L. Taylor asked about the wording of items on the checklist on the template. J. Croskey said that the template is designed to cut and paste as a word document, and items that did not pertain to a specific student could be removed. There was a discussion of item wording.

R. Leary said that informing faculty of student AIPs could give that student more attention, but it is also possible that faculty will see the student as underperforming, in a self-fulfilled prophesy. A. Roberts noted that students who receive financial aid cannot be treated differently from students who do not.

C. McAleer asked who identifies students’ need for an AIP. She noted that on the form, the student agrees not to withdraw from a class, but there are times when a student may be better off to withdraw, if there are no financial aid implications. This condition takes away options for the advisor and student where there is no financial aid issue. She asked who completes the form, whether it is done for every student regardless of financial aid, and how students were notified.

J. Croskey said that the policy still needs to be amended. The provost’s office is having students whose GPA is below 2.0 complete one. The form is slightly different for students who receive financial aid. Comments on the form can be sent to J. Croskey for review.

S. Boyden said that there needs to be clarity on the consequences if a student doesn’t meet the conditions on the form. She suggested that there needs to be a good flow chart for faculty

K. Whitney asked who should get the comments. J. Croskey will collect comments.

J. Touster said that the AIP conflates financial aid issues and academic issues, and suggested there should be two separate forms that look very different. C. McAleer noted that a student may receive aid one year and not be eligible for aid the next, or vice versa, but that if they don’t follow an AIP, they are not in good standing and wouldn’t be eligible. There was a discussion. J. Croskey said that there is a separate form. C. McAleer said that it is confusing. R. Frakes asked if this is a new process. A. Roberts said that students who were on probation were not being held to it over summer unless they needed financial aid.

D. Lott asked about the role of Academic Standards committee. D. Clark said that the policy was changed over the summer, and as a result of the change, the academic standing and probation policies were conflated. The academic standing policy was completely changed, and suspension and the AIP, which is the financial aid piece, were put together. The process was confusing over the summer, since students were suspended under the old policy, but everything was changed in July.

J. Lyle asked about the role of advisors, since the AIP involves student aid. J. Phillips noted that a student could blame their advisor if they lose aid eligibility. K. Whitney said many other universities have started to use professional advisors, in part because of liability, and that this has both good and bad aspects. There was further discussion of the advisor’s role in the AIP process.

1. **New Business**

**A. Academic standards policy –** J. Phillipssaid that there are concerns with the policy that came out over the summer, since it did not accord with the normal process. The new policy references a process involving the Senate’s Academic Standards committee and its chair. The committee did not have the chance to discuss or review the policy before it was implemented. The current policy was not approved by Senate. At the least, J. Phillips suggested that language involving the Academic Standards committee and its chair should be removed from the policy. If Senate later decides to adopt a new policy that does involve Academic Standards, it could then be revised.

J. Phillips made a motion, seconded by D. Clark, to approve the resolution below.

WHEREAS, Clarion University’s current posted policy regarding Academic Standing now contains language regarding AIPs being “forwarded to the Academic Standards Committee for its recommendation” and “recommended changes to the AIP … conveyed to … the Academic Standards Committee chair”

AND WHEREAS, Academic Standards is a committee of the Faculty Senate and under its purview

AND WHEREAS, Faculty Senate at no time reviewed, considered, or voted on this change in policy,

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Clarion University’s Faculty Senate recommends that University President Karen Whitney ensure that the current policy is immediately rewritten to remove any and all language referencing the Academic Standards Committee and its chair from the University’s posted policy on Academic Standing.

There was a discussion of the resolution. C. McAleer asked if the committee was consulted on the policy. J. Croskey said that at a meeting early in the summer, there was a discussion of the need to create a policy. The policy was created after that meeting and revised over the summer. A draft policy that was seen over the summer by the committee is not the same as what is on the web now. There was a discussion of the language relating to the Academic Standards committee. D. Clark said that the only formal business of the committee during the summer was to look at suspension appeals. R. Nowaczyk and B. Dede attended the meeting and gave the committee some information about the policy. D. Clark then received emails asking him to approve AIPs. He wrote a memo approving all of them in order to facilitate student financial aid, but the committee didn’t actually review the AIPs. There was a misunderstanding over what that approval meant. While the committee did work over the summer, the committee was not part of the discussions about the policy, which was a major change.

C. McAleer noted that there are some issues with the policy itself, including the deadlines that it lays out. A. Roberts said that the section dealing with the Academic Standards committee is the only part Senate can control, and that the provost is responsible for the rest of the policy and process.

H. Luthin asked about the origins of the policy change. J. Croskey said that it was a response to a financial aid compliance issue, which only became clear in July. B. Sweet said that the AIP for financial aid purposes is very different from what the Academic Standards committee normally does. Academic suspension is a separate decision, but the two are conflated in this policy. An AIP could be submitted to Academic Standards as evidence that a student is serious about improving their performance, but remain separate. J. Touster noted that the policy would also mean that someone who doesn’t get financial aid could be suspended, but someone who does has an AIP is readmitted. S. Boyden said that faculty need to be aware of how they are inter-related.

J. Phillips said that over the summer some students were readmitted even though Academic Standards upheld their suspensions. He said that the resolution removes Academic Standards from the current policy but doesn’t address any other issues. C. McAleer said that it would be good if the policy went through the regular process and is approved by faculty Senate. She suggested that Senate ask that the language about the committee be removed and also that the policy comes through Senate. She said that the AIP form lacks clarity and a wider vetting would improve it. R. Leary said that Senate does not have authority to get rid of or change the policy, but can say that policy didn’t follow protocol with regards to the Academic Standards committee and take that part out. He said that the policy was rushed for good reason, but now needs to be vetted. This resolution just speaks to Senate’s role. There was further discussion. A. R said that a next step is to work on the policy with the provost’s office, which has expressed an interest in revising it.

J. O’Donnell said that he understood that R. Griffin said there has to be one policy across the board, regardless of aid. There was a discussion.

K. Whitney asked if Academic Standards asked to be on the form and to be included in the policy. D. Clark said that they did not. S. Boyden said that part of further discussion has to be if the AIP model is even a good strategy. H. Luthin asked if the AIP is a federal requirement. J. Lyle said that the federal government does allow an AIP but does not require it. There is a risk that some students get let back in who will not be able to get back up to a 2.0.

Senate voted on the resolution. The motion passed.

There was a discussion of the process moving forward. The possibility of forming an ad hoc committee was suggested by J. Phillips. The Senate Policy committee will discuss committee structure.

B. **Student issue** - K. Whitney said she was contacted regarding a new transfer student who has a pending court case, which will have some media coverage. She said that she advocates that there is a uniform PASSHE policy to note expulsions and suspensions for behavioral reasons on the transcript, which is not currently done. There was a brief discussion of the specific case.

1. **Adjournment –** A. Roberts moved to adjourn, seconded by B. Sweet. The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Occhipinti

Faculty Senate Secretary