**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on October 24, 2016 in 246 Gemmell. J Phillips chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, D. Farnsworth, E. Foster, B. Frakes, D. Knepp, R. Leary, M. Lepore, A. Lockwood, D. Lott, J. Lyle, C. Matthews, J. May, J. McCullough, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. L. Chambers, M. Dunlap, P. Gent, D. McFarland, T. Pfannestiel, R. Skunda, and K. Whitney was also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:29

II. Approval of the Minutes (October 10, 2016) – B. Frakes motioned (Y. Ayad seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Provost Search Update – J. Phillips asked people on the committee if they had any updates. E. Foster said the process was on schedule and that the committee would be meeting on the 3rd of November.

IV. President’s Report – T. Pfannestiel

K. Whitney said that she did not have a report. She then returned to the subject of the provost search and asked if a job description was out. E. Foster said it was. K. Whitney asked if it had been sent to everyone. E. Foster said that the committee was told that this would occur thru the co-chairs and added that she believed it was on the website.

K. Whitney said she was at Senate because she had been invited to speak on ISLAC and the strike. She said she was glad the strike was over and provided members of Senate with a copy of an email that was distributed on Friday to staff, students, and alums (note: there were slightly different versions sent to each group). K. Whitney said that what she wanted to emphasize was the part of the email that emphasized the fact that while the administration did not have responsibility in negotiating the contract with the union it did have everything to do with the calm, civil, and orderly running of the university during the strike. K. Whitney then added that she needed to leave soon in order to meet with local APSCUF leadership. J. Overly told the president that she appreciated the fact that she shook the hands of the students who presented at the Board of Governors meeting on 10/6. E. Foster also indicated that she thought that was a nice gesture and said it meant a lot. K. Whitney then said that she thinks the key now is to figure out how to communicate going forward.

K Whitney asked what senators wanted to know regarding ISLAC; J. Phillips said that ISLAC was addressed at the prior meeting.

J. Phillips then returned to the subject of the email that was sent out on Friday. He indicated that an alum forwarded him a copy of the letter and that the alum found it unacceptable that the letter spoke about faculty who abandoned the rest of the family. J. Phillips added that the person was concerned that the letter could be read as suggesting faculty were not confident and courageous. K. Whitney said that she felt the matter would be best addressed a private, personal conversation with the alum. J. Phillips said that he thought there were a number of persons giving the document a similar reading and added that there needed to be communication to make sure that faculty did received the appropriate message from the email. K. Whitney said that she was not at Senate to be berated but to get advice. J. Phillips responded by indicating that he was not berating the president but offering a suggestion that she make the intent of the message clear to the faculty and the students to ensure clarity as to how the faculty are/were viewed.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that Student Senate had a conference at Slippery Rock the prior weekend and that most of the student governments (11) from the state system had representation. He also noted that there were three new senators and two open seats. R. Skunda reminded people that the Social Equity dinner was coming up.

R. Leary asked what happened at the conference. R. Skunda said that the students attended various informational sessions, took pictures together, and started a Twitter hashtag, “#settleforthestudents,” in relation to the strike.

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – A. Roberts

A Roberts began by stating that the objection deadline was extended to 9:30AM Wednesday. Open hearings will be held on the 9th; programs with submissions need to have representation there. A. Roberts expressed hope that the outstanding major objection is being resolved.

D. Lott asked if the GEEC will be submitting proposals to CCPS. J. Phillips said no. J. Phillips explained that the GEEC has no role in the current curricular process and explained how the GEEC would have to operate in the status quo (GEEC-> Senate->CCPS->Senate). D. Lott asked if people would be elected or appointed to the GEEC. J. Phillips indicated that there was uncertainty as the committee was not yet institutionalized. A. Roberts noted that the provost keeps saying that the goal is to “reinsert Faculty Senate into the process” but that he does not know what the provost means by that.

 B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

M. Lepore said the committee would meet on November 7thand that there were several initiatives to review.

 C. CCR – E. Foster

No report

 D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

J. Phillips said he met with P. Gent to discuss AIPs. He said he was reviewing the documents she provided to try and identify a way to fit Academic Standards back into the process. He noted that this may require by-law revision.

D. Lott said that it was his understanding that if students on an AIP took a semester off that they could re-boot back into the system. J. Phillips said that he was not sure if that was the case and said we need to make sure that students are not being exploited whatever the process is.

 E. Budget – C. Childers

C. Childers said that S. Johnson attended the recent BRIC meeting in her place. She said that it seems that RCM is defunct and that BRIC may be dead. D. Lott indicated that he understood it to be RCM-lite. C. Childers said she would be following up with L. Cullo.

 F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

The faculty mentor dinner is tomorrow. D. Knepp said that there are 7 mentees and 18 RSVPs. He added that J. Croskey, B. Dede, and M. Lepore will be speaking at the dinner.

D. Lott inquired about the recent email indicating the ability to make up lost time due to the strike and asked if the process was to play out on a faculty-by-faculty level. B. Frakes said that it still needed to be worked out as the deans had not yet received directives on that front.

 G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

Facilities Planning is looked to reschedule their meeting due to the strike.

 H. Venango – J. May

No report

VII. Old Business

1. By-Laws Status Update – Remains tabled.

VIII. New Business

1. CCPS Read-ins –

A. Roberts read them in.

1. Admissions & Scholarships – M. Dunlap & D. McFarland

M. Dunlap began thanking Senate for the invite and expressing interest in admissions processes. She moved to a bit of personal background for those that do not know her and said that she believes that people matter and that we need to value all students. She then walked thru the admissions funnel process noting how the school buys names of students to contact, sends information to them, and then contacts them to develop them as prospects. She said the goal is enrollment and retention. She noted that D. Behrs developed a 5 year admissions plan while he was here and said that we are using that while in the interim because we have had some success with it already. M. Dunlap stressed that she thinks out of state admits are up and that overall numbers are returning to previous levels. She said we need to work on transfers and that this is part of what is driving the scholarship decisions.

She then moved to discussion of what was different for Fall 2016 admissions. She noted that we contacted 200,000 students who didn’t know us as we realized the local population was insufficient. She said qualified applicants were up and yield was outstanding. M. Dunlap said we have done this form of out-reach out for Fall 17 as well. She then said that she knows that some were concerned that we were up 100 deposits in February but didn’t see more admits for this fall. The thought is that this meant people committed earlier and are here. She agreed we need to convert more potential students into actual students. M. Dunlap spoke to yield activities that are different. She noted the success of the early start program (of 93 participants 87 are at CUP), she highlighted the scholarship contest which will be repeated, and the ability to submit FAFSAs earlier. She concluded by stating that the goal is to get admit decisions out quicker.

D. McFarland started by noting that he did address Senate last year so figured we just wanted specific updates from the previous information. E. Foster asked for specific numbers associated with the scholarship contests. D. McFarland said he would cover that and then gave a brief recap of the merit-based scholarship abilities and process. HE then spoke about the contest and noted that we had 20 students attend with 15 offers and then 12 students matriculating into the university. He added that we have had issues in awarding endowed scholarships and said we are working on increasing those awards. D. McFarland said we have worked with White Board on data analysis and learned that we were bringing in people with bad credit scores when enrollment was down. He suggested that enrollment stability, assisted by the scholarship initiatives, is helping that.

J. Lyle asked with there is so much energy dedicated to attracting transfers. D. McFarland noted that we are more successful because we are primarily trying to attract community college kids and can offer less scholarship money than a true freshman may require.

B. Frakes said he was at the scholarship competition last year and noted that there was a moment at the lunch where it seemed none of the parents there had any idea about the existence of the PHEAA grant, which he felt was weird. M. Dunlap said there is a need to do more for financial literacy.

R. Leary said he was confused about talk of increased yields given that the numbers are flat. M. Dunlap responded that sustaining enrollment from 15-16 was positive. R. Leary said he was concerned with celebrating flat numbers and as of yet hypothetical increases.

R. Leary asked if we sell certain programs over others. M. Dunlap said no.

D. Clark asked how, in light of the strike and student support received, we could market that. M. Dunlap noted that we continued events during the strike and said that a some striking faulty even helped guide some prospective students/families looking for the admissions office.

D. Knepp said he appreciated the “people matters” slogan. He noted that he met a student recently with a3.7 at the open house and was curious how long we take to get back to that type of student. M. Dunlap said that if we don’t have the piece about standardized tests then there is a need to follow-up. D. McFarland said that if the person is admitted then they would have a scholarship letter sent out quickly. He said that person would be looking at roughly 2000 in scholarship money.

D. Farnsworth asked, in regards to the open house, if there is there some document with key information for faculty so that we know what to share. He admitted he didn’t know about FAFSA and scholarship details. M. Dunlap said she was glad to hear the request because she would assume that financial aid people would simply give out that information.

A Roberts asked if there is data about how effective the scholarship was in getting students that might not have come. D. McFarland said that there is not lots of data since we only have one year of the program. His sense was that we gave a lot of money to people that would have still came. J. Touster wondered how would even be possible to find data that really spoke to this question.

B Frakes said he has a memory that there was a push to give certain majors money. D. McFarland said that preceded his arrival.

J. Lyle asked if the White Board merely confirmed what we already knew. D. McFarland said yes.

1. GEEC – T. Pfannestiel & L. Chambers

T. Pfannestiel spoke on the General Education Executive Committee. He began by noting that some of the matter was introduced at Policy two meetings ago. He noted that there are three pieces to the GEEC. First, work on general education as per the new policy coming from the Board of Governors to make sure the university complies with it and our Middle States obligations. He said that the GEEC is working to make sure there is alignment. T. Pfannestiel said the second piece is curricular; once policies are aligned look to see what work needs done. He said that he thinks Faculty Senate will be key here. The third piece is assessment to close the loop. The provost said that he has discussed things with Policy, K. Whitney, and S. Montgomery to find that place where can Senate fits. He added that the issue to figure out how to move forward creating a Senate role in the curricular committee process and codify and reinstate that role as per the old Gen Ed Council. He noted that the GEEC would have oversight of policy and assessment and that the second piece would come from Senate to ensure curricular success. He said he does not want this to be ad hoc; he wants to sit with Policy and others to develop this. T. Pfannestiel added that S. Montgomery is working to populate the GEEC so that it is representative of the university. He asked P. Gent if she wanted to add anything; she said that sums it up pretty well.

J. Phillips said that the issue is that general education assessment is going on but that there is a need to close the loop since no structure exists now because there is no place to advance recs since they are not coming from the departments.

C Childers asked what the difference between the GEEC and ISLAC is. T. Pfannestiel said that ISLAC is tasked with assessment across the university whereas the GEEC would focus exclusively on general education. He noted that there is overlap but reinforced that they are not the same. L. Chambers added that S. Nix left a detailed map for assessment and she copied/distributed stuff related to the matter for Senate and the GEEC. She noted that some of the stuff on the document is in process. L. Chambers said that standard 12 is the biggie for going forward; she said that she is doing some focused assessment with general education but added that Middle States will want more.

J. Phillips asked if this is direct assessment for the fall. L. Chambers said it is a mix of direct and indirect assessment.

R. Leary asked if it is correct that we have not yet seen the new Board of Governors policy. T. Pfannestiel noted that it is out there but that R. Leary is correct. The provost said he would get the policy distributed.

1. Student Strike Support

J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, and R. Leary make comments thanking the students for their support of the faculty during the strike and noting just how instrumental they were in a quick resolution of the matter. R. Leary motioned, with E. Foster seconding, that Senate send out a resolution to acknowledge the support of the students. A call was also made to send acknowledgement thru email to the community for their support as well. The motion passed thru unanimous acclimation.

IX. Adjournment – B. Frakes moved (R. Leary seconded). Unanimous passage.