**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

The Faculty Senate met on Monday, February 9, 2015 in Room 246 Gemmell. J. Phillips chaired the meeting, with the following senators present: Y. Ayad, D. Clark, J. Croskey, R. Frakes, R. Leary, C. Li, D. Lott, H. Luthin, C. Matthews, L. Occhipinti. J. O’Donnell, S. Prezzano, M. Reef, B. Register, A. Roberts, M. Robinson, E. Sauvage-Callaghan, A. Shannonhouse, B. Sweet, L. Taylor and J. Touster. R. Nowaczyk, E. Green, S. Nix, B. Dede, and K. Whitney were also present.

1. **Call to order –** J.Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
2. **Approval of Minutes**

R. Frakes moved and S. Prezzano seconded a motion to approve the minutes from January 26, 2015. The minutes were approved.

1. **Announcements**

* Welcome to new senator J. Touster, who will be replacing J. Heard this semester.

1. **President’s report – K. Whitney**

* Thanks to those who were able to meet with candidates for the VP of Student Affairs. The committee will be meeting later this week and hopefully will be making a decision by the end of next week.
* P. Fackler will be leaving on February 13 and the new VP of Finance, L. Cullo, will be starting February 16.
* C. Weibel has been hired as new head football coach. Many of the athletic teams have new coaches, and will emphasize students’ academic accomplishments as well as increasing competitiveness, which has a positive impact on students and the community.
* K. Whitney will be meeting with the chancellor and presidents next week.
* R. Nowaczyk provided updated information on searches: candidates for the associate provost position will be on campus next week; telephone interviews have been completed for the director of Education.
* R. Nowaczyk said he will have a detailed enrollment report at the next Senate meeting. Right now, we are up 204 acceptances without deposits, and down 60 deposits. There will be another admitted students day on Feb. 21.

1. **Student Senate Report – E. Green**

There have been some changes in student Senate committee chairs for the upcoming semester.

1. **Committee reports**
2. **CCPS – B. Sweet**

The deadline for experimental and special topics courses is Friday.

1. **Student Affairs – C. Matthews**

The committee will be meeting this week regarding the Wright scholarship.

1. **CCR – J. Croskey**

Elections will be coming up soon.

1. **Academic Standards – D. Clark**

A summary was distributed to senators. Of 102 suspensions, 42 students submitted appeals to the committee, which readmitted 13 (31%). 7 students appealed further to Academic Affairs, and 4 were readmitted through that process. 7 students did not go through committee, but went directly to academic affairs, and were all readmitted.

J. Phillips noted that the committee is concerned that there is a lack of clarity about readmits through Student Affairs, since some appeals were not submitted to the committee, which part of the appeals policy.

B. Dede responded that some of the students who didn’t appeal to the committee were in intersession courses, and others had been out of school for one or two semesters. In one case a student improved his/her gpa over intersession to a 1.9 and has a specific plan. All brought in additional information, and were past the deadline to appeal to the committee.

There was a lengthy discussion. D. Clark noted that either policy should reflect what we actually do, or we should follow the policy consistently. J. Phillips suggested that there could be clearer guidelines developed for students with extenuating circumstances. K. Whitney suggested that there may need to be a procedure in place that deals with different situations. The committee will have further discussions with academic affairs over the next month to develop clearer criteria.

1. **Budget –**

R Frakes has agreed to be budget chair. The committee will be meeting with the new VP of Finance.

1. **Faculty Affairs – L. Taylor** – No report
2. **Institutional Resources – A. Roberts**

There was a facilities planning meeting on 1-29. The highlights include: a complete master plan is being sent to PEC; Marrick-Boyd renovations, including a lot of backstage work, will be scheduled around the summer theater program; bids for Tippin are in; Becht is ahead of schedule, and the new suites are on schedule.

1. **Venango – L. Smith** – No report
2. **Old Business**
3. **Constitution and bylaws** – J. Phillips met with K. Whitney last week. The administration wants to take the revisions to meet and discuss regarding the language on general education. J. Phillips pointed out that the current constitution was not signed by president and trustees, which will be an issue for the upcoming election, since Senate’s membership has changed. There will have to be an election for the General Education Council, since changes can’t be signed by then.
4. **Missing minutes –** The minutes that were missing from the website have been found, and the website will be updated.
5. **New Business**
   1. **CCPS –** There will be read ins for the next Senate meeting.
   2. **CCR –** A motion came from the committee to appoint E. Lewis to the associate provost

search committee. The motion passed.

* 1. **Inquiry seminars** – S. Nix, the coordinator for assessment and faculty professional development, spoke to Senate about the inquiry seminar pilot project. J. O’Donnell asked her to describe what inquiry seminars are. S. Nix replied that involved faculty are in the process of determining what “inquiry seminar” means for Clarion. Workshops were held to introduce the “innovators’ group” to inquiry seminars, review what they look like at other institutions, and develop what they will look like here for 2015-16. The seminars will be focused around high impact practices, especially undergraduate research. In order to have some continuity and be able to assess the seminars across disciplines, the group would like to see that three outcomes are met across all seminars – information literacy, writing, and teamwork. A seminar may also have other outcomes within the discipline. R. Leary asked how they will be assessed. S. Nix replied that the group is still talking about this, and may use rubrics from the AAC&U. R. Leary asked if there will have to be a minimum number of students enrolled in a seminar to make sure it runs. S. Nix replied that this is not decided yet, but that the provost has agreed to support the pilot. R. Nowacyzk said that funding is still under discussion and may come out of the Arts, Education, and Sciences RC. R. Leary asked how this could impact the RC. R. Nowacyzk replied that if the seminars look like they will lose money it will be covered from his office, but if there is a gain it may go to the RC, and most of the seminars will be in Arts, Education, and Sciences. H. Luthin asked about the expected class size of 25, noting that this is large f or a seminar-style class. There was a discussion of class size issues. S. Nix noted 24 faculty have gone through the professional development workshop to develop a seminar proposal, and that there will be a meeting this week to look at the offerings, number of sections, and so on, which will allow an estimate of number of students. S. Prezzano asked how inquiry seminars articulate with the engaged learners program and students who have been identified as being at risk. S. Nix replied that some faculty in academic enrichment are proposing seminars, but that decisions have not been made about whether at-risk students will self-select a seminar or have one with someone who has been working with engaged learners. S. Prezzano noted that there is a stigma attached to being in an “at risk” class. There was further discussion. J. Phillips asked about the decision-making process for inquiry seminars, what the process will be to approve a course as an inquiry seminar, other than going through CCPS as a new course, what the procedure or policy will be to decide if something is good for an inquiry seminar, over the longer term, and how assessment will be done. S. Nix replied that the concern about academic integrity is one of the most important, and that rather than having one specific body in charge, she envisions that it will be the faculty. The current criteria was to participate in the faculty development workshop, but going forward that probably shouldn’t be only criteria. She said that at this point it is not really part of CCPS or Senate responsibility, and that she will recommend that there be a committee, at least until it is decided if these will become part of general education curriculum. There was further discussion about approvals and assessment.

J Phillips asked about incentives for departments to offer inquiry seminars, since they may be smaller than other introductory level offerings. R. Nowacyzk said that departments will need to talk to the dean. There was further discussion about FTEs and financing small introductory courses. S. Nix noted that there is some evidence that seminars like this help retain students, which would be a benefit for departments. J. Phillips noted that it may be helpful to track retention numbers and the seminars over a few years to see if it is working. K. Whitney said that this pilot stage will have commitment from provost that departments will be made whole. The research is very clear that inquiry seminars help with retention quite a bit, especially with students who are at risk. As this solidifies past a pilot, there is an opportunity that it can help with recruitment. The provost and/or the dean will have to make commitments about finances for the pilot. A. Roberts asked what it means to “make whole” the department. K. Whitney replied that it should be at the level of the college, which is the RC. It is a complex process. A. Roberts asked how it would affect the department scorecards. K. Whitney replied that there will be college scorecards. J. Phillips suggested that he would like a recommendation from Senate about inquiry seminars. The Provost’s office could set out what they would like to see, then there can be faculty discussion of pedagogical goals, followed by a Senate recommendation, so that there can be benchmarks that can be examined over a two-year time frame so that there can be a decision on whether to add them to the gen ed curriculum. S. Nix invited senators to contact her with any further questions.

1. **Adjournment** – B. Sweet moved to adjourn, seconded by C. Matthews. The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Laurie Occhipinti

Faculty Senate Secretary