**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on March 20, 2017 in 246 Gemmell. J Phillips chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, S. Boyden, C. Childers, D. Clark, J. Croskey, E. Foster, B. Frakes, S. Harris, D. Knepp, R. Leary, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, J. Overly, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, B. Sweet, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. T. Pfannestiel, R. Skunda, and B. Smith were also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:31

II. Approval of the Minutes (February 27, 2017) – B. Frakes motioned (P. Woodburne seconded) approval of the minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

III. Announcements

Service Learning Trip to Navajo Nation, May 14-25 –

J. Croskey said that this is a program Clarion is running with IUP. He added that participants will get to see sites and work with the Navajo people. He said that students can earn credit if they want (but registering for credits is not required).

Faculty & Staff Scholarship Recognition, April 18

Chair’s election tomorrow – Carlson and Frame

Chronicle Interview –

J. Phillips stated that he met with a reporter for the Chronicle of Higher Education today to discuss the PASSHE and reorganization.

IV. President’s Report –T. Pfannestiel

T. Pfannestiel began by noting that he would be meeting with Student Senate tonight to discuss the academic calendar. He said that he would like to discuss the calendar with Faculty Senate on April 3rd. He said he would distribute policy information about the rules governing calendar adoption/implementation.

T. Pfannestiel then moved to the HHS search. He remarked that the university has a great search committee and said that initial applications have been reviewed. He said that the committee was forming early thoughts about who to do reference checks on. He admitted that the pool was not as large as he had hoped for but followed that up by stating that the committee believes that very qualified individuals have applied. The plan is to have airport interviews on the April 1st weekend and then invite persons to Clarion two weeks later.

T. Pfannestiel then brought out the latest iteration of the GEEC. He noted that it has increased detail with regards to the charge, specifies English composition and math at the membership level, and added clarity regarding Faculty Senate’s role in advancing recommendations as well as trying to clarify some of the terms in the document. B. Sweet asked why the asterisk is still in the document; T. Pfannestiel said it will be removed. J. Touster asked what the meaning of “pedagogy” is. T. Pfannestiel said he honestly wrestled with the term and thought about “professional development” as an alternative. J. Touster said he liked the Provost’s interpretation of “pedagogy” but noted that he feared the potential of exploitation by others. T. Pfannestiel reiterated that truly is no intent to dictate how people teach courses. R. Leary noted that he has looked at state policy on general education and added that he thinks we are aligned with that policy currently. R. Leary asked what would happen if the committee looked at the PASSHE and Clarion policies and drew different conclusions. T. Pfannestiel said the GEEC is not a decision-making body but a recommending one. R. Leary then asked if the president then has the authority to determine if we are aligned with the PASSHE policy if Faculty Senate disagreed with that assessment. T. Pfannestiel said that the administration would discuss the state/local policy here at Senate, but added that yes the president would have such authority even though this piece of paper does not allow the president to establish their own system of general education. R. Leary then asked if the president has the authority to change general education at Clarion. T. Pfannestiel said yes. S. Boyden noted that there is nothing here about the role of the president vis-à-vis general education. R. Leary said he was baffled by this position since Faculty Senate voted against general education reform in the spring of 2016. T. Pfannestiel said that the administration looks for input from Senate and CCPS but noted that he believes that faculty do not control curriculum. J. Phillips interjected and stated that this is not a forum for discussing the CBA. J. Phillips then asked the provost to explain the process in the “curricular changes” portion of the document. T. Pfannestiel noted that recommendations from the GEEC come to Senate who then would choose to send them to CCPS. D. Knepp asked about the status of personal performance faculty inclusion on the GEEC; T. Pfannestiel noted that they should be there and they were accidently omitted in the current document. D. Lott stated that E. Foster and he had asked previously about Venango College inclusion; S. Boyden said she thought that Venango participation will be stipulated to be part of the membership under the responsibilities section of the document.

T. Pfannestiel concluded the report by noting that he will be sharing information about an accelerated BA-to-MA program with Academic Council. He said that the administration is looking to figure out a local process for allowing movement from a BA to a MA as per a new PASSHE policy which allows undergraduates to take graduate courses for both undergraduate and graduate credit. There was brief discussion walking thru the policy (students must apply as juniors and have a 3.0 or better, no more than 12 master’s credits can be taken for undergraduate credit, departments would be charged with determining placement of the credits on their undergraduate checksheets). J. Lyle asked if there was known literature discussing the pedagogical impact of such programs on both undergraduate and graduate programs; T. Pfannestiel said he did not know what materials the Board of Governors referenced in building the policy. P. Woodburne noted that this could be a financial win for the school if it means that students do not leave to seek a MA/MS elsewhere. R. Leary asked if there was talk of how this may impact existing articulation agreements; T. Pfannestiel said he would look into that. J. Phillips asked the provost what he wanted with all of this regarding the Senate; T. Pfannestiel said it was an informational item and he wanted input. People can email the provost with thoughts. T. Pfannestiel also suggested talking about this for a couple minutes at the next meeting.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda - No Report

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – B. Sweet

B Sweet reminded everyone that the deadline for objections is Friday. He added that the open hearing will take place on April 11th.

1. Student Affairs – M. Lepore- No report

 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/General Education Recommendations

Regarding Inquiry Seminars, B. Sweet has sent recommendations to CCPS that were prepared with help from L. Chambers. He noted that they will look at the recommendations on the 28th.

J. Phillips said that if we think we are going to change the Seminars then may want to look at the larger slate of recommendations advanced by B. Sweet at the final Senate meeting of 15-16. B. Frakes moved to untable the recommendations and send #2 (investigate changing flags to essentials) to CCPS, S. Boyden seconded the motion. D. Clark asked if anyone wants to eliminate the idea of flags and just make it so all general education courses meet the flag requirements. S. Boyden said we would be the only school in the country without flags. B. Sweet said that the proposal is a response to Middle States. J. Touster said students find it difficult to find some flags. R. Leary noted that the flag proposals are for Middle States not the students. R. Leary said he is not sure all schools have the same number of flags/essentials but conceded that “essential” has more gravitas. Motion unanimously passes.

P. Woodburne asked what the Inquiry Seminar proposal will look like. J. Phillips and B. Sweet noted that proposals are still in the process of coming from CCPS.

Regarding B. Sweet proposal #3 (diversity essential), S. Prezzano motioned (A. Roberts seconded) to untable the proposal and send it to CCPS. R. Leary asked if the quoted language is part of the status quo policy; B. Sweet said he thinks so and J. Phillips recalled that it is like this now. Motion unanimously passed.

Proposal #4 (professional ethics essential) was motioned by P. Woodburne (seconded by B. Frakes) to be untabled and sent to CCPS. S. Boyden asked why it was termed “professional,” and D. Knepp noted that ethics can be disciplinary. J. Phillips noted that renaming the flag may impact the structure of the courses. Y. Ayad asked if these courses (for recommendations 3 and 4) would be at the 100-200 level. It was noted that the essential can exist in upper-level courses. J. Lyle stated that’s status quo policy as well. Motion passes unanimously.

J. Phillips asked what to do about proposal #5 (capstone) since Senate can’t recommend to departments. B. Sweet provided context for the recommendation by noting that B Wolvert suggested capstones for assessment and the call to require a “capstone” was part of that. B. Sweet added that lots of departments have capstones but they don’t call them that. D. Lott asked if this would apply to associates programs as well. B. Sweet said he thought about this for BA/BS programs. D. Lott said he thought this could be a problem for associates programs. S. Boyden suggested that we should specify the requirement as applying to bachelors-level programs. R. Leary asked if CCPS would be holding hearings on these proposals, and if these recommendations would be communicated to chairs/senators so that people can use the opportunity to object. B. Sweet said technically there is no ability to file an objection to a gen ed proposal at CCPS, the person must come to Senate even though they have posted gen education things to the CCPS site in the past for visibility purposes. That said B. Sweet said he thinks the point is good. B. Sweet added that CCPS probably won’t have dealt with all of this before the open hearing though he suggested notice is good and added that there is a need for an opportunity to comment. J. Phillips suggested we can ask the provost/president to ask people to adopt capstones, thru a simple resolution, by the end of fall 2017. P. Woodburne added that we can limit this to BA/BS programs. S. Boyden motioned (P. Woodburne seconded) to send the recommendation to the provost. Motion passed with all but D. Clark in favor.

J. Phillips moved to #6, oral communication essential, and noted that we do seem to be light on this as people have known there is a communication issue with several students. B. Sweet said he thinks we need to thoroughly define what an oral communication essential is definitionally so people know how to determine whether a course should be eligible. J. Phillips asked who would define this. D. Lott asked if it could this possible be bumped to the level of ENG 111; J. Phillips said he was not sure we can recommend that but we could recommend someone figure out how to implement an oral communication essential. B. Sweet said he thinks people can do this within departments. J. Phillips asked if the GEEC would be a good place to evaluate this possibility; T. Pfannestiel said yes. B. Frakes motioned (P. Woodburne seconded) to untable and send the proposal to Academic Affairs and the GEEC for definitional clarification and implementation. Motion passed unanimously.

Regarding #7, eliminating multiple prerequisites, B. Sweet said he thinks this would be difficult to do given the inevitable complexity of such discussions. He suggested the question is how to best prune prerequisites from general education courses. J. Phillips recommended the GEEC look at how to clean up prerequisite presentation. J. Touster motioned, with S. Boyden seconding, to untable and recommend to the GEEC. Motion passed unanimously.

Proposal #8 was noted to be already addressed as it covered Inquiry Seminar reform.

1. Presidential Evaluation

J. Phillips stated that the Council of Trustees is not conducting oral interviews with Senate or APSCUF this year because we are outside of the 3-year review cycle. J. Phillips said he asked the Council if they wanted written comments and they said no to that as well. He added that the Trustees are saying that regular meetings constitute sufficient consultation. He asked people what they wanted to do. Discussion of possibilities followed but no conclusions were reached and J. Phillips said he would consult with APSCUF and see what they wanted to do on this issue.

VIII. New Business

1. Len Cullo, Budget Discussion – L. Cullo was not able to attend as he was called out of town. Senate will look to reschedule the meeting.
2. Pam Gent, 7-Week Classes, April 3 – J. Phillips reminded everyone that P. Gent would be attending on April 3rd to discuss the nature of the 7-week programs and give a brief assessment of them. J. Phillips asked people to submit questions they have for P. Gent in advance if they can.

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