Faculty Senate
Clarion University
11/6/17

Faculty Senate met on November 6, 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, J. McCullough, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, J. Phillips, S. Prezzano, A. Rosati, B. Sweet, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. D. McFarland, 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. 10/23, 2017) – B. Sweet motioned (J. Lyle seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III.   Announcements
J. Phillips noted that the APSCUF contract vote was next week, and that state and local voting is tomorrow.

IV.   President's Report – P. Fackler
No report

V.   Student Senate – R. Skunda
R. Skunda reported that the Social Equity Dinner is coming up Nov. 15th. We can RSVP on CU Connect. J. Phillips will speak on ageism.

A. Roberts recognized the outside guest, D. McFarland at this point. The minutes record their comments at the end of this document under New Business.

VI.   Committee Reports.

        A. CCPS – B. Sweet
B. Sweet said that open hearings occurred Nov. 3, and that the committee voted down the application to allow COBAIS an exemption from Inquiry Seminars. These objections will come to Senate on Nov. 20 for discussion and final vote. B. Sweet noted that Senate Policy will decide the parameters of the discussion to take place in the open Senate meeting.

B. Sweet said that CCPS also voted in favor of the W flag changes, and wondered how it should be brought to Senate. Discussion concluded that, due to the dissolution of the Gen Ed Council, and following the procedure on the Q flag changes, CCPS will create a face sheet, and bring the W flag changes to Senate as a CCPS proposal.

        B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore
M. Lepore said that the committee will meet Nov. 21, as this is a Friday classes in place of Tuesday classes day, which opened up members' schedules.

        C. CCR – J. Lyle
J. Lyle said that the slate of members to fill the University Wide Faculty Professional Development Committee is finalized. As the membership comes to the body from a standing committee, it does not

need a second. Vote on the 3 names, Kurt Regester, Jay Annadatha, and Robin Bilan, was unanimous acceptance.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report

E. Budget – C. Childers

No report

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

D. Knepp noted that the Mentor Dinner was held Oct. 24 with 19 attendees, including 6 new faculty attending (not all tenure track), and several mentors, and four speakers. Evening was deemed a success. D. Knepp thanked the attendees and the speakers.

G. Institutional Resources – E. Foster

E. Foster said that, in response to J. Lyle's complaint that Macintosh Computers are not as useable on sympodiums as are Windows machines, and that they require adaptors, which further limits functionality, she sent an email to S. Selker and T. Fogarty. E. Foster noted that she is in contact with T. Latour re: setting up a meeting with the library regarding institutional resource issues.

H. Venango – J. May

Faculty Forum at Venango was held. D. Lott reported

VII.   Old Business
    A. By-Laws/Constitution
A. Roberts said that he preferred to take the two votes separately, going first with the vote on By Law changes.

By Law changes
To recap, these eliminate many of the subcommittees of the various standing committees. In all cases, the reduction in subcommittees did not result in committees losing jurisdiction over those areas of interest. M. Buchanan found a typo or two, but other than that, these changes received no further discussion.

A. Roberts noted that a vote in favor requires 2/3 of the quorum. Having counted 23 Senators present, a vote requires 16 to pass. A. Roberts called for a vote. Passed unanimously.

Change to Constitution
Proposed change to Constitution Article II Section 4, part 3, *An individual with a workload that is entirely online may designate the campus s/he would like to represent, designating such at the time of nominations and appearing on the ballot for that campus (either Clarion or Venango) and eligible to serve on Faculty Senate as a representative of that campus if elected.*

Discussion ranged across 3 major areas, as summarized by J. Phillips. These 3 topics are 1) where someone can vote—So Senate must codify language allowing online faculty to vote, 2), create and opportunity to serve on senate, 3), representation of the content of the discipline. J. Phillips noted that CUP has mechanisms for online faculty to have issues heard, and that the issue today is to work out where people can vote. J. Phillips noted that we ought to focus on this issue, and we can with the proposed language. General discussion recapped and duplicated much of the discussion from the last Senate meeting (Oct. 23). Several senators noted that the discussion was about things that have never happened, and may never happen.

In terms of topic 1) J. Phillips noted that a goal with the language should be to increase the opportunity of online faculty to vote, and to do what is best for faculty. General discussion noted that it is not clear why a wholly online faculty member should be attached to Venango campus, despite the fact that many online faculty teach in programs, like Nursing or like Human Services, Rehabilitation, Health & Sport Sciences. Having said this, some nursing, and other programs, are housed at Venango, but other nursing programs are housed on main campus. Thus, the notion of 'housing' a department or faculty member is not fixed, and cannot be geography located. E. Foster and D. Lott noted that workload trumps department. D. Lott noted that online faculty members do definitely have their own issues, which are not necessarily those of faculty at Venango campus. Additionally, online faculty often cannot know the issues on Venango campus, as they may live in Ohio, or indeed, almost anywhere. Thus, allowing them to designate Venango may cause some loss of representation of Venango issues on Senate. This was a reason for the Venango carve-out.

In terms of issue 2) several Senators made the point that it makes no sense to assign wholly online faculty to Venango, simply because many departments that have online faculty are based at Venango. J. Touster and others argued that while it would be good to create an opportunity for online faculty members to do service, and get promoted, the paucity of wholly online faculty, and a carve-out specifically for wholly online faculty would overly privilege these faculty. Discussion here centered around the issue that it is hard to do service, and the best solution may be to organize things such that online faculty would not have any more impediments against their ability to serve and get promoted. D. Lott noted that if an online faculty were to get elected, then this person would not know Venango issues. C. Childers noted that, if this representative was not doing a good job representing, then they would be voted off the next election. S. Boyden noted that, as it stands, not all departments or faculty groups are represented. Biology has one representative, business has none, and math, physics and chemistry is very highly represented. J. Phillips noted that any solution will harm some, and the issue is to find a solution that does minimal harm to most, while respecting online faculty. Any carve-out for online faculty, because of the difficulty in getting elected, would likely leave position unfilled, whether taken away from Venango, or main campus, or if added to Senate. If added to Senate, then this has implications for tie votes. The current even number of Senators, plus the president is to make tie votes impossible.

In terms of issue 3) currently an online committee exists on campus, so there is a mechanism to bring online issues to Senate through the normal reporting processes. Thus, as J. Phillips noted, this is not a key issue for today's deliberation.

A. Roberts called the question, and, as above the issue requires 2/3 of the 23 Senators in attendance (or 16 votes) voting 'aye' for passage. The vote was Aye: 15, Nay: 6, Abstention: 1. A. Roberts voted 'aye' and the motion passed.

VIII.   New Business

A.   Scholarship Software– D. McFarland
D. McFarland, staff and committee have looked at software to make the application and awarding of scholarships more efficient. In concert with Bloomsburg, as of March we will be using Next Gen Solutions. In the first phase, the student view will be open, with a focus on Foundation scholarships. Later the faculty view will come online, with expanded availability of college and departmental scholarships. This software allows students to see scholarships that are open. As students start the application, the software recognizes which scholarships they qualify for, based on GPA, class standing, major, etc, and will direct them to specific scholarships, and allow them to automatically fill out those applications. The software is searchable along many variables so departments can see who is eligible, who has received scholarships, etc. The software can give

'blind' searches so that the committee does not see the students' names, if that is desired. J. Touster asked about scholarships that are awarded by a department, which do not need an application. D. McFarland said that the student can see these scholarships, but the software will tell the student that no application is required.

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