**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on January 30, 2017 in 246 Gemmell. J Phillips chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, C. Childers, D. Clark, E. Foster, B. Frakes, S. Harris, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. T. Pfannestiel and R. Skunda were also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:33.

II. Approval of the Minutes (December 5, 2016) – B. Frakes motioned (Y. Ayad seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Provost Search Update – J Phillips reminded people that on-campus interviews would begin on the 31st. Interviews were slated for Jan. 31, Feb. 2, and Feb 7, but the Feb. 2 candidate withdrew from consideration. After J. Phillips briefly walked through the schedule for each candidate, E. Foster encouraged folks to attend the various sessions.

IV. President’s Report –T. Pfannestiel

T. Pfannestiel began by thanking everyone for their role in starting the semester. He said there was good news regarding Venango. He said that in addition to the already public search for a dean the Venango College would be changing in name to the College of Health & Human Services. T. Pfannestiel said that there had been discussions about the name for some time and added that the administration had the Zimmerman Agency conduct a survey to assess the current/potential names. Based on the survey it became clear that the community did not understand what “Venango College” meant, particular with regards to the relationship between the campuses. T. Pfannestiel said the change would become public in the next day or so. He added that this affair also indicated a need for a deeper discussion about how potential name changes could occur.

J. Touster asked if the name would be “Clarion University’s College of Health & Human Services; T. Pfannestiel said it would. J. May asked if it would be referred to as “the Venango campus”; T. Pfannestiel said it would. T. Pfannestiel added that the plan is to refer to “Clarion-Venango”, “Clarion-Pittsburgh” (West Penn facility), and “Clarion-Online”.

E. Foster inquired what the impact on the Venango College dean’s search would be. T. Pfannestiel said that unfortunately there would need to be revisions to the search and added that he was not at liberty to speak on the change until it became official. He said he hopes to get the committee together and revise the ad to get “founding dean” added. E. Foster asked if the position will be an academic dean instead of executive dean; T. Pfannestiel said it would be an academic dean position.

R. LEARY indicated that he was disconcerted that the change was occurring without going thru the traditional structures. He then noted that Venango has faculty there that are part of programs which exist here. R. Leary asked how will changes occur regarding cross-campus existence and so forth. T. PFANNESTIEL said that the university community as a whole (including the unions, the departments, and so forth) will discuss these issues and act. R. LEARY asked who will make the final decisions. T. PFANNESTIEL said it would be the president.

J. Lyle asked why three years of data was sufficient to justify a change. T. Pfannestiel indicated that there really wasn’t a plan to review things at this point but that it just became clear there was an issue as confusion and enrollment decline grew.

J. Touster asked how long R. Gonzales was here as the Executive Dean. T. PFANNESTIEL said it was roughly two years. J. Touster stated that it is a concern that we are messing around “under the hood” even though she was here less than two years.

T. Pfannestiel then moved to an enrollment update and noted that our numbers are up for spring to spring. He said that in terms of new students he thought there were twenty more students. He noted that the administration is still working the retention data and suggested that he should have numbers for the next meeting though he said it appears that the numbers will be up. T. Pfannestiel said that fall was down 144 from previous fall and the norm would be to expect the spring to be similar, but he said he thinks will only be down 43 students, which means retention is up. He also noted that when you factor in December graduates the number is good.

T. Pfannestiel said that the Board of Governors comments and how they were presented is a concern. He followed this up by noting that he is pleased to say that 94 of 104 students expected for the recent Open House were here, which is a good sign. He added that there is a need to push back against the recent comments. R. Skunda asked for clarification about what was said. T. Pfannestiel briefly summarized the recent comments suggestions potential closures or mergers within the PASSHE.

T. Pfannestiel then noted that deposits for 2017-2018 are up (47) from a year ago.

J. PHILLIPS stated that people need to realize that the comments were probably delivered within the context of trying to secure greater financial support from the legislature for the PASSHE but also added that the idea of a merger was odd. He then asked if the viability study for the current PASSHE structure was being conducted by internal or external forces. T. Pfanestiel said that internal persons were responsible for oversight but said that external consultants for directly responsible for administering the study.

R. LEARY asked if we have retention numbers for fall to fall or spring to fall. T. PFANNESTIEL said he would get those numbers.

A Roberts inquired about the fall CCPS proposals to see if they have been signed by the president. T. PFANNESTIEL noted that the president got the documents last week and added that the it was the whole stack as approved by him. T. Pfannestiel presumed K. Whitney would be signing the approvals in the near future.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that Wingo was coming back on February 17th. He noted that Student Senate is trying to fill an open seat.

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – B. Sweet

B Sweet reminded everyone of the email he sent out with the relevant CCPS dates for the semester. He said that he anticipates bringing the major proposals for approval on April 17th. He read in one read-in.

 B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

No report

 C. CCR – E. Foster

E. Foster presented an action item regarding the Venango College dean’s search. She presented the following persons as a slate to be forwarded to K. Whitney: Renee Bloom, Nancie Hunter, Janis Jaricki-Liu, Deb Kelly, Doug Knepp, Laurie Pierce. The slate was unanimously approved.

 D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

J. Phillips noted that the committee would be meeting soon to discuss AIPs and work on a process for making things more systematic.

 E. Budget – C. Childers

No report

 F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

No report

 G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

A Roberts said that facilities planning met last week and the subject of the meeting was primarily the Tippin project. He noted that the school is close to pre-bids, hopes to have bids done by the end of March, and anticipates work beginning late April or Early May. He said that graduation may be a factor in when the actual work begins. T. Pfannestiel said that the issue would be discussed tomorrow with the president. R. Leary said that the project could be interested to watch over the next couple of months given the statement of the chancellor regarding closures. J. Phillips asked if there is a plan is to build a pool at the rec center. T. Pfannestiel said there is and added that the money is there. J. Phillips said he was concerned that the students may not react well to the idea of funding the construction of multiple pools on campus.

 H. Venango – J. May

No report

VII. Old Business

1. By-Laws Status Update – Remains tabled.

VIII. New Business

1. CCPS

If you are reading this, then you know a read-in was read-in

.

1. Academic Calendar

J. Phillips called for a motion to approve the calendar for 2017-2018. B. Frakes moved, E. Foster seconded. R. Skunda noted that Student Senate voted against the calendar because they feel break is too long between semesters and the students want summer back. J. Phillips asked if Student Senate made a recommendation. R. Skunda said that they’ve issued comments to the provost. T. Pfannestiel said that we are still operating under common calendar so part of this is locked in for 17-18, but the potential for flexibility with the 18-19 calendar may be opening up. R. Leary asked how much of the current calendar is due to the desire to have a winter session and asked how much money we make from that. T. Pfannestiel said he was not sure how to answer that but said winter session expanded because the common calendar expanded and added that winter session is an in-the-black enterprise (like summer). J. Lyle inquired if the vote matters to authorize the calendar or even serve as a protest action; it was determined it does not. J. Phillips asked what the impact on money would be with change; T. Pfannestiel said they need data. J. Phillips highlighted the potential impact of the 7-week courses on the summer schedule and indicated a need for someone to come to Senate and discuss 7-week courses. J. Phillips called for a vote on the calendar. Senate approved the calendar with J. Lyle, R. Leary, and J. Overly voting no and J. Touster abstaining.

1. General Education Executive Committee, 2 Faculty Senate representatives

J. Phillips stated that he included a copy of the GEEC doc as given previously. He added that the document is a little dated. He then noted that we are to pick two persons to serve on the GEEC (they do not need to be members of Senate) and they will fill slots that would otherwise be filled outside of the Senate. T. Pfannestiel indicated that the document was dated and said he would get the information about the current configuration.

D. Lott asked if the need for smaller committee explains why the Venango person was eliminated. T. Pfannestiel said it was not. T. Pfannestiel said that it was unwieldy to have that slot given that Venango College is becoming HHS and he suggested that people can still get on the committee thru the discipline-based opportunities. D. Lott responded by stating that he views this as a concern given the difference between associates and bachelors discussions. E. Foster said she wanted to reiterate D. Lott’s concern and noted the history of Venango inclusion. T. Pfannestiel suggested that a solution would be to make sure he, along with the GEEC chair, choses a Venango person. E. Foster and S. Boyden said that maybe there is a way to put that need in as an official responsibility.

P. Woodburne stated that he recalls B. Woolford’s thoughts on the General Education Council being too small and wondered if that criticism might be applicable here. T. Pfannestiel stated that the key to know is that this group’s function is to make sure Clarion’s gen ed policy aligns w PASSHE policy and then conduct assessment. T. Pfannestiel said there is a curricular piece that needs addressed but returned to the existing by-law situation as something that means the GEEC will not deal with that as-is.

R. Leary suggested that Faculty Senate has previously expressed concern about general education definitionally, commitment-wise, and so forth so he is not sure why this proposal is here. He said that he needs to know what authority this GEEC will have (what “policy” is, will the committee have authority to interpret PASSHE, etc.) because he thinks that Senate appointment of persons will sanction the body in the minds of everyone on campus. J. Overly added concern about “review of course proposals” and wondered what its meaning is. T. Pfannestiel reiterated that this is an old document and stated that he does not agree with “authority” as used and defined in the old document. T. Pfannestiel clarified that there is no authority here because the GEEC would just issue recommendations. R. Leary expressed concern about what input means as it relates to action, and said he fears objections may not stop implementation.

D. Clark noted that Senate has by-law issues being held up, including an assessment committee. He asked how would this impact that. J. Phillips stated that there could be an impact and said we could re-do the by-laws to accommodate the GEEC.

J. Phillips closed the discussion by stating that there does seem to be an issue of trust undermining consideration and added that he would welcome K. Whitney coming in to speak to the matter to help rebuild that trust.

1. Inquiry Seminar Discussion

J. Phillips said that L. Chambers is coming on 2/13, and perhaps P. Gent as well, to discuss the Inquiry Seminars. He said we need to review the pilot and make a recommendation, which goes to CCPS so we can figure out how to continue the program if we want it. It will then come back to us and then to go to the president. B. Frakes and E. Foster said that they want more retention data for fall to spring; J. Phillips said that he thinks we will get that data.

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