

**Faculty Senate  
Clarion University  
10/9/17**

Faculty Senate met on October 9, 2017 in 246 Gemmell. A. Roberts chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, E. Foster, S. Harris, D. Knepp, M. Lepore, A. Lockwood, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Rosati, B. Sweet, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. L. Cullo, M. Shaffer, T. Kitzmiller, T. Pfannestiel, and R. Skunda were also present.

I. Call to Order – A. Roberts called the meeting to order at 3:30.

II. Approval of the Minutes (Sept. 24, 2017) – J. Phillips motioned (D. Clark seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously. Typo noted, will be corrected and sent to A. Roberts.

III. Announcements

GIS Conference – Y. Ayad noted that the annual GIS conference will be held next week with presentations, and attendance by local and regional employers and vendors of GIS technology. He also noted that GIS has many applications that one may not be familiar with.

Grad and UG Research Grants – S. Prezzano noted that the deadline for Grad and UG research grants was tonight at midnight.

IV. President's Report – T. Pfannestiel

T. Pfannestiel began by praising all the people involved in Homecoming who made it a success. He received many comments about the future of Clarion, etc, and was good to see/hear much good feedback about the turnaround on enrollments, etc.

T. Pfannestiel discussed the ongoing work with Academic Partnerships, who work with universities to enlarge various online programs, particularly graduate programs such as MBA, RN to BSN, M. Ed to enlarge those programs. He stressed that this is a marketing firm, who brings potential students to Clarion, but they do NOT replace our admissions function. The contract has to be officially OK'd by the PA Attorney General. The firm indicates that they often double enrollments in the programs they work with (sometimes 100 plus additional students). In response to a question from J. Touster, T. Pfannestiel said that the financial split was 50/50, with half the added tuition and incidental fees going to Academic Partnerships for the students they attract, while CUP earns 100% of any tuition etc from students we bring in on our own. B. Sweet noted that the 50/50 split seemed high, and asked about a backing out process. T. Pfannestiel noted that there is a way to back out, where we would finish a cohort if we wanted to back out. S. Boyden asked about the assumed online class size in the estimation of revenues. T. Pfannestiel said that they had assumed class sizes of 35 students. B. Sweet noted that early in our history CUP assumed that a 25 student class size was optimal. B. Sweet referenced the Western Governors situation about the implication when online classes are badly done. T. Pfannestiel said that many programs said that they were willing and able to have larger class sizes. He also noted that AP provides some instructional design resources. Y. Ayad asked if this meant we could re-open Engineering. T. Pfannestiel suggested probably not, though the revenues generated could be used for a variety of programs. Engineering is expensive. A. Roberts asked about ability to track our students vs those AP gets for us. T. Pfannestiel said we need to get into the coding, but AP seems to have success in doing this, and success in divvying up students and revenues. CUP is the only state system school working with AP. PASSHE recommended that AP work with us, due to our focus on the specific online degrees that they like to work with. J. Phillips asked about the student profile, and whether they meet our standards. T. Pfannestiel said that AP do NOT take over our admissions process. AP brings us students, and we decide if we want to admit them. Y. Ayad asked about the success rates of AP in meeting their goals, but also in getting good students. T. Pfannestiel cited several states where AP has worked, and where enrollments have risen dramatically.

T. Pfannestiel noted that CUP does NOT have an Interim President yet, but that P. Fackler has been recommended. The Trustees will vote prior to Oct. 19. Until they vote, we do not have an Interim President. As soon as they do, he becomes official and the notice will go out.

T. Pfannestiel presented drafts of the academic calendars for the next three years. T. Pfannestiel has to bring this to Student Senate, but after that, barring big issues, it will go to the Trustees for approval, and then to PASSHE. T.

Pfannestiel noted that the placement for the two 7-week sessions into the fall and spring semesters had not yet been added, but that they would be. T. Pfannestiel reiterated some of the changes, such as the shorter break between fall and spring, and hence the shorter winter session. J. Touster noted that a Tuesday start to final exams means that the last Monday class has low attendance, and is wasted from an academic perspective. T. Pfannestiel agreed, but noted that short of adding other breaks or starting after MLK day, this was what had to happen. J. Overly asked if the calendar coincided correctly with ALF, etc. T. Pfannestiel said that it did agree with all standard issues like ALF. S. Boyden asked if this calendar is supported by the athletes who perform at CUP, and like the fact that more faculty will be around to support them.

T. Pfannestiel then opened the floor to questions.

P. Woodburne asked about program moratorium issues, whether T. Pfannestiel had any news on that front. P. Woodburne noted that ECON was in a unique position in that it had been removed from COBAIS and put into CAES, but then the only major within CAES is scheduled to be put on moratorium. Simultaneously, ECON has no input in COBAIS when that college seeks to remove ECON classes from its curriculum. T. Pfannestiel said that he expects to talk to the union at Meet and Discuss and will have something to say after that.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda reported that student senate will revisit the constitution this evening, which has not been done for many years. R. Skunda said that the BSGP conference (board of student government presidents) is coming and 8 senators will attend.

A. Roberts recognized the outside guests, L. Cullo and M. Shaffer, at this point. The minutes record their comments at the end of this document.

VI. Committee Reports.

A. CCPS – B. Sweet

B. Sweet said that the read-ins (new business) are read in. B. Sweet said that the major proposal date is 9/29, and the objection date for 10/20. The open hearing is scheduled November 3.

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

No Report

C. CCR – J. Lyle

J. Lyle said that J. Sambor's name will be added to the slate of committee members from Venango. This is technically a recommendation to be voted on. Unanimous vote.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report

E. Budget – C. Childers

Len Cullo just spoke, so covered anything she would have.

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

No report

G. Institutional Resources – E. Foster

E. Foster had to leave early.

H. Venango – J. May

Following up on the rumor of the elimination of Faculty Forum at Venango. Faculty Forum is not actually cancelled, and she will get detailed information for next meeting.

## VII. Old Business

### A. By-Laws/General Education Recommendations

Still old, still business. Due to lateness of hour, due to lengthy discussions surrounding L. Cullo's report and that of T. Kitzmiller and M. Shaffer, discussion on Bylaws put off until next meeting. Also, to be discussed next time is the restructuring of Faculty Professional Development Grants. There are State System grants and University grants. S. Prezzano noted a problem, which is trying to get fixed. The local grants have not been continued for a few years, and the university may want to reinstitute them.

## VIII. New Business

- A. Budget Discussion -- L. Cullo L. Cullo began by summarizing the two parts of the budget, the FIN and BUD reports. FIN is the actual money spent as of 6/30/17, while the BUD report is the budget for the next year. L. Cullo was pleasantly surprised at the lack of parentheses () around the number of current profits, which denoted that CUP ran a profit for the first time in several years. This was due to doing better on revenues (the levelling off in enrollments) and holding the line on costs (hiring, etc). From L. Cullo's first year, the budget improved from a \$7.1 million deficit to \$4.8 million deficit, to about \$700,000 profit this year. He stressed that much of this was a collection of "one off" situations that all broke in our favor. So, while CUP has made progress, we are not done. L. Cullo noted that while compensation rates, for all employees rose, CUP had fewer employees. This is increasing retirees and not hiring. Sometimes, as in his department, he allocated duties to existing people. Where that can be done, minimal harm comes to the institution. L. Cullo expects next year's deficit to be \$1.1 million. He noted that, due to capital spending (steam tunnels, etc) CUP's cash reserves are low, but not drastic.

The BUD report shows savings in personnel. In response to a question from B. Sweet regarding the decline in faculty shown in the BUD report, and from and S. Prezzano about a reduction in the Anthropology faculty, L. Cullo noted that, faculty did decline, due to retirements, etc. He explained that the decline noted was also due to an accounting technique whereby positions that history shows are unlikely to be filled are removed from the budget, thereby 'saving' money that was unlikely to be spent anyway. L. Cullo said that, should a position be needed in Anthropology, or any department, they could and would be added in. This is an accounting/budgeting issue related to making a more precise budget, and unrelated to any policy regarding hiring. In response to a question from B. Sweet, L. Cullo noted that this past year showed a tighter control regarding overload payments, showing some savings.

- B. Judicial Mediation Services, New Code of Conduct – M. Shaffer and T. Kitzmiller. M. Shaffer and T. Kitzmiller said that the student code of conduct/Rights and Regulations was revamped because the old rules had become convoluted and no longer fit the university or students. They worked with NCHERM, which advises on Title IX rules and the like, and revamped the code to better align along three areas and put into three documents. They expect that the revamped code will fit CUP's needs into the future. Document 1 relates to Student Code of Conduct. These are the Rules, the individual Code items. This document is now more precise and provides specificity and due process. Document 2 relates to Community Standards, alcohol, drugs, sexual misconduct and the like. Document 3 relates to the Academic Code, which has largely remained intact. Regarding Document 1, while JMS has seen an uptick in reported academic violations, nothing has gone to a Board under the new regulations yet. The rewritten Document 1 enables JMS officers to talk in depth with students about the violation and the process. The process is written in a specific format. The second document relates to federal compliance, as well as sexual conduct and RSO policies. This is sort of a Bill of Rights document, rights of speech and assembly, etc. Document 3 was deemed solid. T. Kitzmiller is getting out to student groups/dorms, etc to inform students about the new code. New code meets state and federal guidelines, and what may change legislatively, such as changes to sexual misconduct process, as per DeVoss's proposed changes. Goal is to make sure all are treated fairly, and get students to take responsibility for actions.

K. McIntyre asked about the vibe on campus re: race relations, from the perspective of the JMS, and whether new language in the code makes clear that bad racial/gender behavior is not good. M. Shaffer has a student subcommittee to meet that will look at this issue. Police Chief Hendershott and S. Hoke and M. Shaffer have been looking into guest speakers, etc. related to free speech issues at Berkeley, Texas A&M, etc. Students have expressed concerns related to race/gender issues. She noted that responsibility

for race relations ought not be pushed off onto R. Laugand or J. Croskey, who can come to classes to talk about racial issues. K. McIntyre noted that policy changes are needed. M. Shaffer suggested Building Bridges could be part of solutions, but policy changes are likely need as well.

M. Shaffer and T. Kitzmiller discussed the new process for Academic Integrity Incidents. There are two basic options. Option 1 is where faculty assign a grade and that is all. M. Shaffer and T. Kitzmiller ask that, even if this route is taken, for faculty to report the incident to JMS, so a record can be created to help another faculty member who may be trying to decide how to handle a similar problem down the line. Option 2 involves the reporting the violation to JMS, and that this involves a hearing. Students can accept the board decision, or can appeal. Regardless of which option is taken, M. Shaffer and T. Kitzmiller ask that faculty go to [www.clarion.edu/judicial](http://www.clarion.edu/judicial) to report the incident. J. Lyle asked why anyone would choose Option 1. T. Kitzmiller suggested a comfort level, or the faculty member not wanting to damage the relationship with the student. Use of Turnitin software seems to work in terms of getting students to not appeal the judgement/grade to a Board. T. Kitzmiller suggested that Option 2 is more for serious incidents, and to generate evidence for repeated incidents and pattern of behavior. J. Lyle asked what a 'record' means for a permanent student record. Would a report of plagiarism stay with a student forever? M. Shaffer said that records are held for 7 years and that CUP would be the only ones holding those records. Some professional schools or employers may look for academic incident records, or that students may need to disclose incidents. The key for CUP is to let faculty know about patterns of behavior. C. Childers wondered if there is an automatic policy of notifying faculty of a second or third incident. M. Shaffer said that there is not an automatic system. The onus is on the faculty member, but that it would not violate FERPA etc for JMS to tell a faculty member about a prior incident. If there is a second offence, JMS does not mandate going to Option 2, but 'recommends' it. J. Touster noted that putting language into a syllabus gets complicated/awkward regarding the reporting of serious incidents to JMS. J. Overly noted that we could say "serious incidents may" be reported. T. Kitzmiller suggested taking language right out of the Code of Conduct. J. Lyle asked if any of the results of the Options were a trigger for expulsion. At what point do multiple incidents result in expulsion? M. Shaffer said no concrete answer exists to this. Expulsion is one option as a result of a Board hearing. M. Lepore wondered if we must notify students of the use of Turnitin software. M. Shaffer agreed that faculty must notify students that such software is being used. A. Roberts noted that possibly the issue may be one of copyright. A. Rosati clarified whether faculty Must file an incident report in Option 2, or they are Encouraged to file a report. M. Shaffer said JMS Strongly Encourage a report into Option 2. A. Roberts asked about the time frame. Often an incident may result in a grad of zero on a paper, but if faculty wants the incident to go to a Board, then perhaps the time frame will be such that a grade may have been awarded. T. Kitzmiller suggests awarding an 'I' for the course until the dispute is resolved, especially if late in the term. M. Lepore asked about the change, described in the 9<sup>th</sup> bullet point, whereby the JMS can make a determination of a sanction without a Board hearing. M. Shaffer said that if a student agrees that a violation occurred, or if the incident was serious, T. Kitzmiller could issue a sanction. It is unlikely that a student would accept that sanction, and a Board hearing could have a hearing on the severity of the sanction, and not the violation itself. Academic cases automatically go to a Board hearing. JMS tries to get faculty onto those Boards to look at evidence. M. Lepore noted that S. Fenske wants to get Student Affairs Committee involved in the issues. M. Lepore is concerned to not duplicate work. M. Shaffer noted that much of what his group does is more like an advisory group, and will work with Student Affairs, etc.

IX. Adjournment – B. Sweet moved (S. Boyden seconded). Unanimous passage.