**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on December 5, 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, J. May, C. Matthews, J. McCullough, K. McIntyre, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. L. Chambers, L. Cuello, D. Hartley, T. Johns, T. Pfannestiel, R. Skunda, B. Smith was also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:30

II. Approval of the Minutes (November 21, 2016) – B. Frakes motioned (A. Roberts seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Provost Search Update – E. Foster said that airport interviews occurred and that on-campus interviews were being worked out for the end of January and early February. Four candidates are being brought in. B. Frakes asked how many were interviewed at the airport; E. Foster said eight. E. Foster indicated that each of the candidates have traditional degrees and appointments and have worked their way up thru the ranks at their respective institutions. Y. Ayad let people know that S. Hoke had health issues during the interviews which required him to leave early. J. Phillips indicated he would make an effort to find out the health status of S. Hoke.

Inquiry Seminar Celebration, 11 a.m-4 p.m., Wednesday, Dec. 7, Gemmell MPR – Students will be presenting their research findings from the various courses and faculty would be judging the presentations as part of the course assessment process. E. Foster expressed gratitude to the faculty and staff that are evaluating.

Contract Vote – It is occurring now thru Wednesday at 12PM.

IV. President’s Report –T. Pfannestiel

T. Pfannestiel began by thanking people for the work they put in over the course of the semester, and asked people if there were questions.

B. Frakes asked about the status of fall to spring registration. T. Pfannestiel stated that many individuals had registered since Thanksgiving but added that there were still some additional students to get registered. T. Pfannestiel asked people to contact him if they knew of folks needing registered that were experience issues.

J. Croskey asked if it is possible to recommend students earn an associate’s degree while concurrently earning a BA/BS. T. Pfannestiel said students can do both and added that there is no impact on financial aid for such a move. J. Touster asked if such advising could negatively impact retention as it may create an incentive to leave the university after completion of the first degree. T. Pfannestiel stated that he thought those students probably would bail anyhow.

T. Pfannestiel closed by noting that he was working to expedite CCPS matters thru the Office of the Provost.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that wingo was a success. He noted that roughly 225 students attended the event.

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – A. Roberts

No report

B. Student Affairs – M. Lepore

J. Croskey spoke for M. Lepore, who needed to leave early. J. Croskey stated that the committee met recently and decided to explore alternatives to Who’s Who.

C. CCR – E. Foster

No report

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

No report

E. Budget – C. Childers

No report

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

No report

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

No report

H. Venango – J. May

No report

VII. Old Business

1. By-Laws Status Update – Remains tabled.

VIII. New Business

1. CCPS

A. Roberts noted that the COM proposals which had been previously tabled were being withdrawn.

A. Roberts took up proposals 151-153 and clarified the status of the objections (or lack thereof). He noted that while there are no official objections that Economics has concerns with the proposals and added that all three come forward with a positive recommendation from CCPS.

B. Frakes asked for clarification regarding the purpose of the proposals. A. Roberts noted that all three make changes to the lower core for COBAIS’s BSBA programs but added that the proposals covered the different concentrations.

R. Leary said that as he looked at the revised checksheets, he understood it that a student would not be able to complete the BSBA if they do not take the two economics courses classes even though they are not credit requirements for the right side of the checksheet. T. Johns said that that is correct. R. Leary stated that he has problems with the continuing devaluation of general education by forcing courses for the right side onto the left. T. Johns stated that students need the economics courses for the degree, added that he feels people benefit from economics, and then noted that the placements (in terms of general education) are merely recommended. P. Woodburne interjected and add that this was the result of reducing the credits for graduation from 128 to 120. D. Clark asked if these placements are part of status quo; J. Lyle said that they were.

Proposal 151 passed with S. Prezzano, J. Lyle, B. Frakes, and R. Lyle objecting.

Consideration then moved to proposal 152. P. Woodburne spoke up and stated that Economics objects to 152 and indicated that the loss of ECON 309 as a core requirement would force significantly reduce departmental need and force the firing of someone. T. Johns noted that MATH 131 will be revised to make it a better fit for COBA’s need and then stated that the new Data Analytics courses are important replacements and highlighted the need to give students the flexibility to take other courses. R. Leary responded by stating that he feels “it’s for the students” is commonly used as a tactic to kill discussion of important issues.

J. Lyle asked if the new checksheet would require majors to complete two-thirds of the new minor in data analytics and followed up by stating that idea of renewed elective flexibility is arguably a hollow claim as a student pursuing the BSBA would be foolish to not take the other two courses. T. Johns agreed that students would have the majority of the minor work completed but did not agree that it would be illogical for a student to not complete the minor.

J. Overly asked why the checksheet is so wide open with its math options. T. Johns said that this is a separate section on this sheet and noted that a lot of business students do not need calculus but do need math. He added that the change means students can be advised into calculus. C Childers noted that 232 and 270 have always been interchangeable.

J. Phillips called for a vote on 152. 152 was unanimously defeated,

The Senate then moved to153. P. Woodburne and T. Johns agreed that the proposal was similar to 152 with minor differences given the lack of need for data analytics for the concentration. A. Roberts asked if this a moot proposal given the defeat of 152. P. Woodburne supposed so. 153 was unanimously defeated.

J. Phillips then asked if P. Woodburne would like to pull 151 given the outcome of the 152 and 153 proposals. P. Woodburne said he would. It was unanimously agreed upon to pull 151 from the slate of approval proposals.

A. Roberts withdrew the MATH 132 proposal.

A Roberts then moved to the Q-Flag proposal, and noted that it received a positive recommendation from CCPS. R. Leary asked if the goal of the proposal is to simply operationalize what had been originally intended. A. Roberts stated that was correct. The Q-Flag proposal was unanimously passed.

1. L. Cullo – Budget and RCM update

L. Cullo began by stating that he thought he was primarily being asked to speak on the status of RCM and field questions. He also referred to his prior visit in the spring of 2016 as covering some of the material he would be addressing and then moved into a summary of the budget and finances report. He stated that the deficit of 4.7 million in 2015-2016 was a significant improvement from 7 million deficit of 2014-2015. He added that right now the report shows a balanced budget because legally it has to show a balance of zero. He then remarked that the report does not include the APSCUF contract numbers because it is not yet formally approved. L. Cullo anticipated a 2.2 million deficit for 2016-2017 and 1.3 million for 2017-2018. He cited this as progress but added that for E&G purposes we are still in the red. He then took questions on the finance information.

A Roberts asked what the reserves are. L. Cullo said 7 million when taking into account the loss for this year.

D. Clark asked how the budget for 17-18 looks with the contract. L. Cullo said he was not able to talk about that as it would constitute an unfair labor practice.

L. Cullo noted that cash-wise Clarion has about 25 million dollars, which is probably in the middle (if not higher) of the PASSHE system. He stated that the system recognizes the improvements which are taking place.

J. Overly asked what constitutes “other” on report. L. Cullo said that it is a number of smaller expenses and highlighted the costs associated with the nursing union as the largest.

C. Childers asked if the decline in capital expenditures and transfers is realistic. L. Cullo said that there is no real rhyme or reason to explain the reductions but then said yes they are trying to cut expenses in that category. He replied that the school did spend on things like the new suites and stated that we used auxiliary monies.

J. Lyle asked about the status of smaller departmentally run accounts which seem to have vanished. L. Cullo said the answer is both yes and no, in terms of whether they are gone. He added that they went thru with the RC managers and assessed accounts that can be used for deficit reduction and noted that this process is still taking place. Y. Ayad said that he department has money which exists in one of these accounts and noted that it is money from the community not the university. L. Cullo said that the account is not gone but locked until the end of the fiscal year and added that if people have questions about specific accounts to talk with him. B. Smith interjected and said that there have been discussions within the school and with PASSHE about these accounts. B. Smith said that they are waiting for the state system to approve discussions about how to put these accounts back and identify what can properly be claimed. B. Smith added that approval to go thru and identify what can be returned just occurred last week and said that the GIS and Comm accounts, and others, should be returned.

J. Phillips then asked about the status of RCM. L. Cullo said that this was a good question. L. Cullo began by noting that he has looked into RCM and the associated decentralization as ideas and determined that RCM doesn’t work in an era of declining money. He noted that the discipline required wasn’t possible because there is a cost to running the university and it is just not possible to balance the budget. He followed this up by stating that he believes in the idea of decentralization but returned to the claim that the revenue allocation part just doesn’t work in a downturn. He said that such a position was reached after he scoured the literature and talked to others on the subject and found it couldn’t work. L. Cullo said we are now in “RCM-lite” where the focus is on expense containment until things get positive. The plan is to write-up procedure on how to manage budgets once we get to positive to detail the rules of operation for different economic conditions.

D. Knepp asked where housing income was in the Bud & Fin report. L. Cullo said it is not here as it is just E&G. L. Cullo added that if it was, the amount would be small because the Foundation runs housing.

J. Lyle asked if there was there a negative economic impact to the efforts to maintain RCM or if it was just a dog chasing its tail. L. Cullo said it was a dog chasing its tail but also remarked that doing so traded-off with other efforts.

J. Phillips said that the concern he has is that numbers are down for salaries except for the non-represented category. J. Phillips said it seems problematic that manager numbers are up when revenue comes from faculty. L. Cullo said he hears that and agreed that he would say this to himself but also said he is not sure how to solve this via some formula. L. Cullo said he looks at this problem all the time.

D. Lott said that it was his sense with RCM originally that if you, as a program, have the ability to add courses because of increased enrollment then it could be done. D. Lott followed this up by noting that he is not sure things have worked that way. L. Cullo said that if there is demonstrable gains then courses can be added but emphasized that we have got to make sure things are done properly to control costs and account for revenue.

D. Knepp said his area was told to reduce winter offerings because it was not in the budgeting. L. Cullo said he does not tell folks how to allot courses but said that he thinks in general you run courses if there is more revenue than costs.

1. L. Chambers – Inquiry Seminar Report

J. Phillips introduced L. Chambers and added that this would not be her final report, which would occur in the spring. L. Chambers indicated that we are currently in the 3rd semester of the pilot program. She stated that there are 16 sections now and said that she expects one new one in the spring with additional courses in the fall. She then handed out a document summarizing the results of a brief 13 question survey that students completing the inquiry seminars were asked to complete. She said the general finding is that the program is helping students adjust to college even though they are not completing AE 100. L. Chambers then spoke to the upcoming poster presentations at the Inquiry Seminar Celebration and noted that the reviewers will be providing additional, direct assessment data.

S. Prezzano asked what the goal of the assessment is (assess the students or the program, just for the posters). L. Chambers said that the goals was to assess the outcomes for the program based on the rubric developed by S. Nix (use of qualified sources, focused research questions, etc).

R. Leary asked about the nature of the 13 questions. L. Chambers said that some were likert questions, some were yes/no, some were short answer. R. Leary asked by a third of the respondents did not feel challenged. L. Chambers noted that less than 20% gave negative responses and added that the summary does not include neutral responses which artificially inflates the size of the “not challenged” answers.

D. Clark asked how assessment can occur since there is not counter-data for other courses. L. Chambers responded by noting that they are assessing the outcomes and added that she hopes the direct assessment information will be more fruitful. L. Chambers also said that she is trying to compare apples-to-apples by looking at the impact of the seminars on first-time in college students and noted that there seems to be some small positive impact. She stated that was fall-to-fall data. J. Phillips asked about retention rates for the seminars; L. Chambers said that she thinks it is a little higher for the seminars (2%).

Y. Ayad asked if opening the courses to second-year students would be a way to boost enrollment. L. Chambers said that she did not think this was needed but added it was a possibility.

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