**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on April 17, 2017 in 246 Gemmell. E. Foster chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: S. Boyden, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, B. Frakes, D. Knepp, R. Leary, M. Lepore, A. Lockwood, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, B. Sweet, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. L. Chambers, L. Fulton, P. Gent, D. Hartley, T. Johns, M. Kuehn, J. McCullough, S. Montgomery, J. O’Donnell, N. O’Neil, T. Pfannestiel, R. Raeshler, R. Skunda, and T. Taylor were also present.

I. Call to Order – E. Foster called the meeting to order at 3:30

II. Approval of the Minutes (April 3, 2017) – B. Frakes motioned (S. Boyden seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Allison Bechdel – She will be speaking at Hart Chapel on Wednesday at 7PM. People were advised to arrive early to ensure good seats.

Almost Maine – The final performance for the year for Clarion Theatre is coming up this weekend

Undergraduate Research Conference – April 27th, Gemmell MPR from 10am-2pm – S. Prezzano noted that there are 132 presenters for the event.

Walk a Mile in Her Shoes – K. McIntyre thanked everyone for participating in the event.

Senior Honors Presentations – J. Croskey noted that presentations will take place on the 18th at 5:30 P.M. in the Carlson Library (transitioning to Founders Hall at 6:10).

Academic Excellence Events – People were advised to check the schedule for the upcoming events for the rest of the Academic Excellence celebration.

IV. President’s Report – T. Pfannestiel for K. Whitney

T. Pfannestiel began by giving updates for the various searches at the university. He noted that there are three candidates coming for on-campus interviews for the Assistant Vice President of Enrollment Management position in the next week. He stated that there would be more specific information, including dates and times for people to meet with the candidates, soon. The provost noted that there are three persons coming on-campus to interview for the position of Dean with School of Health and Human Services. He added that there was a need to reschedule one of those persons due to an illness.

Regarding general education T. Pfannestiel said that he appreciates the work that has been done so far on this front and added that he has received the recommendations sent to his office. He stated that he hopes to report on those at the next meeting. He added that there will be W-Flag assessment and outcomes recommendations, as well as recommendations about the overall general education policy. It is the goal of T. Pfannestiel to share draft language on the general education policy recommendations at the next meeting of the Senate.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that there was no meeting of Student Senate this week and added that there are Executive Board nominations coming up soon.

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet had no report beyond read-ins.

1. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore said that the committee has a meeting scheduled for April 21st at 1PM in Stevens.

1. CCR – E. Foster

E Foster reminded folks that elections are tomorrow.

 D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips – No report

1. Budget – C. Childers

C. Childers stated that she followed up on the $2.8 million number provided by the president at the prior meeting and learned that the faculty contract contributes 1.35 million to that number. Regarding the $32,000 number that was also advanced at the prior session, C. Childers said that it is the result of a formula where the state is to allocate $9 million to the state schools. Per C. Childers, four schools are getting 6 of the 9 million. C. Childers closed by noted that L. Cullo is projecting a $3.5 million deficit for the next year.

1. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

D. Knepp stated that we still have eleven retirees for the upcoming ceremony. At least three of those persons will not be attending.

 G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts – No report

 H. Venango – J. May – No report

VII. Old Business

1. By-Laws/General Education Recommendations

E. Foster stated that we would deal with these matters at the next meeting as there was insufficient time for discussion.

VIII. New Business

1. CCPS Read-ins – They were read-in.
2. CCPS Proposals

B Sweet began by pulling proposals 121, 127, 136-9, 140-1, 197-202 from consideration in a block vote and then asked senators if there were any other specific proposals they wished to discuss. R. Leary asked to have 128-9 pulled and D. Clark asked to pull 117.

B Sweet noted that the remaining proposals all received a positive recommendation from CCPS and called for a vote on them. E. Foster stated that there was no need for a second as they come from committee with a positive recommendation. The block of proposals passed unanimously.

B Sweet moved to proposal 117. D. Clark noted that he had friendly comments as a supporter of the minor in biology. He stated that he was not sure if BIO 383 existed but said that BIO 382 does. Furthermore, he added that he was not sure if 444 was intended to be on the proposal or if there was a need for a special note about General Chemistry as it is a requirement for another course in the minor. S. Boyden asked if we could fix the proposal here or if it needed to be resubmitted. B. Sweet suggested resubmission for the next meeting. R. Leary moved to table the proposal for corrections, A. Roberts seconded, and the tabling passed unanimously.

B Sweet moved to proposal 121. He gave a brief recap of the history of the proposal and noted that Economics was objecting to changes to the BSBA core. B. Sweet noted that the objection centers on removal of ECON 309-310 from the core as all other parts of the objection have been resolved. B. Sweet then gave the floor to T. Johns and P. Woodburne to make arguments for and against the proposal.

T. Johns began by noting that COBAIS is making the changes to the core because business leaders want data analytics knowledge in our graduates. He added that the changes will not impact the economics or paralegal concentrations. T. Johns remarked that Economics is blocking a skill adoption for over 94% of their graduates. He then said that they leave plenty of free electives so students can add a second major. T. Johns gave data to demonstrate that they give the most free electives across the university. With regards to a claim that the change hurts the Economics Department he stated that the proposal reduces 5 of 23 sections, Economics has four tenured faculty, and Economics will still need one more full-time faculty to meet curricular needs. T. Johns said that COBAIS wants to save free electives and that the motivation is about jobs. He finished his opening statement by saying that he thinks these changes give Clarion the most modernized curriculum in the state system.

P. Woodburne countered by saying that Economics doesn’t perceive this as being good for the students. He said that adding the DA courses and removing Econ would not be good for all business students. P. Woodburne suggested that an alternative would be to build a major for DA-interested students. He added that Economics thinks the pro-double major position is essentially anti-Econ and noted that their compromise was to have COBAIS reduce free electives to keep ECON 310. P. Woodburne noted that 310 is an important course for assessment, and said that ETS testing shows that the course is good for all the students. He said that 309 was originally developed at the behest of COBA. P. Woodburne stated that G. Barboza has argued that 309-10 are important parts of the curriculum at open COBA faculty meetings. Regarding the claim if demand from business P. Woodburn said that there are lots of ways to ask business advisory groups if DA courses are good without meaning that they want reductions in economics. P. Woodburne closed by stating that Economics has no sympathy for double-majoring at their expense but added that the compromise proposal doesn’t mean Econ is inherently opposed to adding DA courses.

T. Johns then noted that he gets that DA is not for everyone. He also pointed out that that chairs of COBAIS did not object to the new degree from Econ. He finished his rebuttal by stating that students can take ECON 309-10 within their free electives.

P. Woodburne stated that when Econ was removed from COBAIS, the official justification was that the program was not growing enough. Th faculty of economics said the key was to create a non-business alternative which P. Frese supported.

B. Sweet opened the floor to questions.

R. Leary asked T. Johns if our business students are they getting job currently. T. Johns said the answer is yes but added that the program is looking to the future. R. Leary asked why we need change if the status quo is successful. T. Johns said they think changes are coming and that this looks like the way things are going.

D. Clark asked if there is there a difference between this proposal and the one submitted in the fall. P. Woodburne said it was different because the changes to math are gone and the stats requirement is not changed. D. Clark asked if this is an improved version. P. Woodburne said that this is a step in right direction but added that Economics thinks these classes, ECON 309 and 310, are particularly important.

J. Overly ask if there are other schools offering DA courses. T. Johns said no, and added that he thinks we are at forefront. T. Johns also said that the DA courses will offset some of the skills loss associated with ECON 309 and 310.

A. Roberts asked if there has been any discussion of a DA 337 or Econ option. P. Woodburne said no. T. Johns said that they think the three DA courses are needed for effectiveness.

J. Lyle asked why the compromise is not a good idea. T. Johns said that 40% of the business students double major and they need flexibility to stay under 120 credits. P.Woodburne stated that accounting is different, and T. Johns said accounting’s need for 150 credits is an exception.

B. Sweet said that the proposal does come with a positive rec and called for a vote. The proposal failed (5 yeas, 9 nays, 3 abstentions).

B Sweet took up consideration of proposal 127 which called for removal of the first-year value flag from the degree. D. Lott asked if the proposal just covers the IT associates and not the AT associates. He stated that after conferring with P. Gent that the AT degree does not have a flag, in fact most associates degrees do not have flags, so they are just trying to keep them uniform. C. Childers asked how and why CCPS voted. B. Sweet indicated it was a 3-3 vote. D. Lott said he has printed examples of other associates degrees to show that most do not have flags. D. Clark asked if the associates degrees are required to have flags. D. Lott said no. D. Clark asked why was there a flag at all. D. Lott said he was not sure. D. Clark asked if there would need to be a subsequent CCPS change with the impending change in college name. D. Lott said he didn’t think so because the move from ENG to ENGL didn’t require other programs to change their checksheets thru CCPS. B. Sweet asked R. Leary what the tie in CCPS means for viewing the proposal. R. Leary said it is effectively a no vote from CCPS as of now. Voting was then explained so members of Senate understood that they are voting to affirm or reject the CCPS recommendation. Proposal 127 was approved as Senate overturned the CCPS recommendation (1 aye, rest nays).

B Sweet moved to proposals 128-129. R. Leary asked how pending changes at Venango, in particular dissolution of the JLTLA department, will impact changes approved here. T. Pfannestiel said that the department will be gone with members voted back into existing departments but the degrees and courses will not be changing. R. Leary asked if these will be programs here at the Clarion campus. T. Pfannestiel said he wouldn’t say any degree is campus-affiliated but university-affiliated. The provost said that discussions are ongoing with faculty about future program affiliation but said he absolutely certain the degrees will continue. The proposals were unanimously approved.

Proposals 136-139. B. Sweet noted that these are Accounting proposals making three-credit undergraduate courses two-credit graduate courses. He said that CCPS asked for additional updates but received nothing so they got negative recommendations. A. Roberts asked what CCPS asked for. B. Sweet said that they wanted course description revision and added info (for instance web delivery information). D. Lott asked if they need to submit separate proposals for distance education. B. Sweet said no that we allow the request to be attached to the regular proposal. E. Foster asked if anyone wanted to respond. D. Hartley said that Accounting didn’t answer the request so he nothing to say beyond expecting a resubmission with more information in the fall. R. Leary reminded folks that the proposal received a negative vote from CCPS which means a yes vote from Senate is required to reject the proposal and uphold the CCPS recommendation. The proposals were unanimously rejected and the CCPS decision reaffirmed.

B Sweet moved the discussion to proposal 140, a request for number of courses in Communication for 2C designation. He said the CCPS vote was 2-2-2. R. Leary said he has problems with the blanket designation. He said that he thinks it is ok for some of these to get 2C status, but has an issue with others because they are skills courses which is 1C and not 2C. He added that this does not mean he would approve them as skills courses but simply that he thinks they are more of a fit under that section. R. Leary also said that several of these courses say that this is a course to develop skills and cited Field Production as an example. S. Prezzano also noted that there are skills-based components to some of the courses. J. Lyle started by stating that despite the CCPS vote that there were no objections to the proposal, only one question focused on whether a first-year student could take a 400-level course, and prior notice about this as a version was submitted in the fall. J. Lyle then stated that there were several arguments in favor of passage of the proposal. He stated that COM as a discipline makes sense historically as part of the Arts & Humanities. He stated that it is important to view these skills courses as general education given the trajectory of communication and technology in the 21st century. He said that there is no prerequisite limit as the CCPS question may have suggested and noted that other courses in general education have multiple prerequisites. He said that there are several comparable “skills” courses in 2C currently and listed courses from disciplines such as ENGL, THE, and MUS. J. Lyle said that while it may be appropriate to reconsider the desirability of the system that is not the place of this vote and therefore COM should not be excluded from what other programs have. J. Lyle also stated that including all the courses facilitates simplicity which makes advising easier. Regarding the existence of ENGL courses in 2C she concurred and noted that courses must have fallen through the cracks. R. Leary said he has a problem with abandoning a traditional general education approach. M. Kuehn noted that there are many courses that can be classified as skills courses across the 2A/B/C categories. J. Lyle also said that the definition of “general education” as stipulated by PASSHE includes skills and practical application in the professional world. B. Sweet noted that given the split vote, the proposal functionally comes with a negative recommendation meaning that a yes vote goes for CCPS and against the proposal. The proposal pass and CCPS was reversed (4 ayes, 12 nays, 4 abstentions).

Next up was consideration of proposal 141, a COMM request for 3B, which received a negative recommendation from CCPS. J. May asked why CCPS gave the proposal a negative recommendation and B. Sweet said CCPS didn’t think it fit typical personal performance. P. Woodburne said he would like an explanation as to why Communication wanted the placement. M. Kuehn said that personal performance covers several activities from debate to music to theater, including costume and set design, and added that Communication believes this course is no different. P. Woodburne asked if there is a final performance or traditional test. M. Kuehn said that the students do have a final performance, which was a video this year. L. Fulton said that the direction of the performances basically depends on what happens during the semester and said it is like using instruments. J. Tauster asked if there is a collective project. L. Fulton said that they do projects but it depends. She gave an example of the students developing stop-action videos. R. Leary said his concern is not with the proposal but why not include courses like Photography. M. Kuehn said that distinction was the one versus three credit requirements. E. Foster reminded people that an aye vote is a no vote for the proposal. The proposal was approved and CCPS reversed with 7 ayes, 8 nays, 5 abstentions.

B Sweet moved to proposals 197-199. These proposals called for name changes from Flags to Essentials. He noted that CCPS gave negative votes because there was no assessment data to support the changes. S. Montgomery said that in her view these are not meaningful changes. She added that as we are preparing a Middle States report and need assessment but cosmetic changes are not very good for PR with Middle States. S. Montgomery said we need to figure out what we want out of general education and then make changes. B. Frakes said he saw this as attempt to glean something out of the general education policy that was considered last year. N. O’Neil said she tended to agree with S. Montgomery because while these proposals are good she would like to see this expanded into larger general education reform. J. Tauster asked S. Montgomery if she felt this action would produce a negative reaction from Middle States. She said she did. J. Lyle said he was confused because it seemed like faculty and administrative positions have flipped since last spring. The CCPS votes were upheld and the proposals rejected (9 ayes, 5 nays, 5 abstentions).

Finally, the Senate considered proposals 200-202 which would integrate Inquiry Seminars into the general education curriculum. D. Lott asked if this would apply to all degrees, include associates. L. Chambers said they would cover all programs and added that we could decide later if we want to include associates programs. J. O’Donnell asked if these were late submissions to CCPS. B. Sweet indicated that they were. J. O’Donnell noted that last year we had larger discussions of potential changes to general education and wondered why that wasn’t happening in this instance to ensure full consideration by the entire university. He added that it would have been very easy to miss these items coming thru CCPS and Senate.

P. Woodburne said he wanted to go back to D. Lott’s point about associates degree inclusion and asked if there is a vehicle to undo the requirement for these programs. B. Sweet said that the proposals are all or nothing today but noted that departments would be able to request out of the requirement going forward. D. Lott said that he knows that associates are not required to have flags but they can ask for them. D. Lott added that he is not sure how easy it will be to remove the Seminar requirement. C. Childers asked why this included associates as she thought we indicated a desire for exclusion previously (S. Boyden concurred with this recollection). L. Chambers said she didn’t get this sense from the CCPS discussion. L. Chambers agreed that there could be after-the-fact changes for opt outs. D. Lott said he thinks it could be easier to add programs as opposed to removing them.

R. Leary asked how this would impact transfer students (both incoming and outgoing). He asked if there has been coordination for transfer within the PASSHE since schools are obligated to take them. L. Chambers said if students transferred in with 30 credits then there would be no obligation to take a Seminar. She added that people would need to look at degree audits to determine how to apply transfer credits.

D. Lott asked if there is a way to remove associates program from the proposals today because he does not want to jeopardize the proposals. B. Sweet said we can move to table but added that he would not be sure of the outcome from that. D. Knepp suggested that tabling would that give time for data collection.

A. Roberts asked if anything changed to the proposals since objections were made by some of the professional programs at the CCPS hearings. L. Chambers said she thinks they are making headway with nursing and said there have been no discussions with COBAIS. Folks from nursing said that the medical imaging curriculum is very tight and noted that it would be hard to include the requirement. J. O’Donnell asked if we excluded nursing as an associates would the demand apply to the BA. D. Lott noted that those students would be equivalent to transfers so they would not be required to take a Seminar.

L. Taylor asked how this fits for online programs. L. Chambers said that we are offering the first, online Seminar one this fall.

P. Woodburne motioned to table the proposal for the next meeting. J. Overly seconded the motion. The motion passed despite 3 nays and 1 abstention. B. Sweet asked if he can get some direction about what to do to revise the proposals. D. Lott again asked if we didn’t already indicate a desire to exclude associates programs. L. Chambers noted that she thinks there are benefits for that population. J. Tauster asked if L. Chambers has concern about an associates group. L. Chambers noted that students in the Associate of Arts, Arts and Sciences program benefit and said that there are several people that are here but not degree-seeking who benefit as well.

E. Foster indicated that we need to truly table the matter. She asked people to write-up their concerns and pass them on to L. Chambers. B. Sweet asked to be included on those communications.

J. O’Donnell asked why we have a process for CCPS if folks can just change proposals here with no campus re-consideration. B. Sweet said that is a good question. E. Foster and B Sweet noted that if there are changes the proposals will go back to CCPS. They added that if the changes are substantive then there may be a need to re-post them for comment. R. Leary said he knows the goal is to have changes for fall 2018 but wondered what would happen if we waited. B. Sweet said that changes need to occur this semester in order to be effectively be implemented for the Fall 2018 semester.

The proposal was finally, truly tabled.

IX. Adjournment – B. Sweet moved (J. Croskey seconded). Unanimous passage.