**Faculty Senate**

**Clarion University**

Faculty Senate met on February 13, 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, R. Leary, M. Lepore, D. Lott, J. Lyle, J. May, K. McIntyre, S. Prezzano, A. Roberts, L. Taylor, J. Touster, P. Woodburne. L. Chambers, R. Lane, T. Pfannestiel and R. Skunda were also present.

I. Call to Order – J. Phillips called the meeting to order at 3:32.

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

III. Announcements

Council of Trustees Meeting – J. Phillips notified the membership of the upcoming Trustees meeting and noted that he would attending as the chair of Senate.

1st Year Advocate – Information came out from E. Schuetz that E. Foster was named the first 1st Year Advocate. Many huzzahs were spoken.

Climate Data – P. Woodburne asked people to sign a petition asking Congress to keep research databases available.

Vinegar Valentines – E. Foster reminded folks of the upcoming valentines and bake sale.

V-Day – K. McIntyre alerted people to the opening on Friday.

IV. President’s Report –T. Pfannestiel

T. Pfannestiel began by thanking folks for their time and indicated he really wanted to be available to answer questions.

T. Pfannestiel said that he really did not have an enrollment update since the freeze date was last Friday which means the numbers are still being worked to ensure accuracy. He stated he maintains the position that we were up as of end of add/drop against both spring-to-spring and fall-to-spring assessments. He attributed this to improved retention.

T. Pfannestiel gave an update for the VP for Enrollment Management search and noted that it was decided to extend the recruiting opportunity after talks with the existing candidates. He said that the school still hopes to have the search completed by May. B. Frakes asked if there are any inklings whether the chancellor’s comments impacted the search; T. Pfannestiel said not that he knows of.

Regarding the provost search T. Pfannestiel offered thanks to Senate, the faculty-at-large, and campus leadership for meeting with the candidates. The search committee has issued their recommendations and the president is reviewing the candidates as of now. T. Pfannestiel stated that he doubted the decision would come this week. D. Lott asked if the search doesn’t get concluded if we need to pay the consulting firm more for a follow-up search; T. Pfannestiel said no they would owe us a search. As for the HHS dean search, the interim provost said the committee has met and added that they are in the early stage of the timeline.

T. Pfannestiel said that he thought the the president spoke to the 18month enrollment management issue and as well as other stuff from the emailed requested (community college initiative). T. Pfannestiel said that the 18 month plan is in the working stage at this point, that there is no complete plan, and that nothing (even a draft) is finalized. The interim provost noted that the goal is to develop enrollment targets for the overall institution not specific departments. T. Pfannestiel added that we have been asked to plan on flat enrollment for PASSHE budget purposes but we are assuming a modest increase for 2017-2018. He said that he is very confident we will see FTE increases for freshmen; the key will be retention. The interim provost said he will share the plan with Senate when it is done.

T. Pfannestiel spoke to the 350k enrollment incentive. He noted that Clarion is working with ReUp Education to identify previous students who are close to finishing their degrees for re-admission. There is a 60/40 split for tuition to get those people back. The “350k” number is because we cannot as per PASSHE write an open-ended contract.

T. Pfannestiel noted that the updated GEEC chart is now available for the Senate.

R. Leary then read a statement regarding the recent emails between the president and the chair and said that he was concerned that K. Whitney’s references to individual meetings with J. Phillips as an alternative to attendance at senate. The statement read as follows:

While it is clearly advisable to meet with the Chair of Senate regularly, such meetings do not preclude the need to meet with Faculty Senate itself. Faculty Senate is a body that consists of elected faculty who all have their own viewpoints, concerns, and questions about the state of the university. While the Faculty Senate Chair does have the responsibility of reporting to the Council of Trustees, when he or she speaks to that body, he or she is reporting on the actions of the entire Senate. It goes against the idea of shared governance to imagine that this shared governance is achieved through occasional one-on-one meetings between the university President and the Chair of Faculty Senate.

It was for this reason that previous university presidents made Faculty Senate meetings a priority in their schedules and rarely missed Senate meetings. They understood it was their responsibility to meet with Faculty Senate to discuss important university matters. They gave information to help faculty understand what were the significant issues facing he university, they listened to and sought guidance from the Faculty Senate, and, yes, they also faced some difficult and challenging questions from Senators. They saw this as their responsibility to ensure genuine shared governance. This was the precedent from which they did not waiver.

Thus, I remain saddened by the continued and unprecedented absence of the President at Faculty Senate meetings. The challenges we currently face can best be addressed through collective understandings and collective action. Refusing to meet with Senate, refusing to accept this responsibility, and refusing to make attendance at Faculty Senate a priority is not the best approach to achieve shared governance and success in addressing the challenges we face.

V. Student Senate – R. Skunda

R. Skunda said that Student Senate had a pair of fundraisers going. He reminded folks of the upcoming Wingo event. He also said that there are two new senators.

VI. Committee Reports.

1. CCPS – B. Sweet

B Sweet reminded everyone of the deadlines and stated that it has been all quiet on the CCPS front so far.

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 name of M. Kilwein to be forwarded to K. Whitney as a replacement for Nancie Hunter. The change to the slate was unanimously approved.

D. Academic Standards – J. Phillips

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

E. Budget – C. Childers

C. Childers noted that L. Cullo is meeting with the RC managers as part of the budget process. She will follow up with L. Cullo in a few weeks to get an update.

F. Faculty Affairs – D. Knepp

No report

G. Institutional Resources – A. Roberts

A Roberts said that facilities planning will meet on February 23. He figured Tippin is likely to be the focus of the agenda. A. Roberts asked Y. Ayad if the credit card situation had been resolved. Y. Ayad said that he has been contacted but that there is no one clean solution.

H. Venango – J. May

No report

VII. Old Business

1. By-Laws Status Update – Remains tabled.

J. Phillips stated that everyone received an updated document regarding the GEEC. T. Pfannestiel noted that there were clarifications regarding the role and membership. He said that he would ensure Venango representation. J. Phillips asked people to take the information home for review.

VIII. New Business

A. Leah Chambers, Inquiry Seminar Report

J. Phillips began by noting that the membership received hard and electronic copies of the assessment information and said he would like to get recommendations for CCPS regarding the future of the Inquiry Seminar program.

L. Chambers stated that the retention data for Inquiry Seminar versus non-Seminar students shows that the Inquiry Seminar students come out ahead. She stated that it seems that skills courses boost retention across higher education, and that outcomes plus smaller classes boost retention. She added that in terms of assessing whether the program is challenging students in a positive way and helping show a positive impact that data shows the seminars are beneficial.

L. Chambers said that courses are currently offered within the departments, and noted that we have two new courses for fall 2017. Her suggested proposal is to have the courses move under their own prefix. She said that she thinks the marketing impact will be beneficial. She noted that we need to emphasize skills plus content (like Edinboro not Slippery Rock – both of whom have some form of a comparable program). Her proposal does not cross-list the courses but they will still be housed within departments.

L. Chambers then spoke to the results from the fall Celebration with poster data. She said that the data shows positive results as most students demonstrated proficiency relative to the outcomes. She said that going forward the courses should be writing-intensive but not flagged as such. She stated a desire to have the students focus on the work of writing even though there is no need to make that a formal outcome for the courses.

J. Lyle asked what the GPA/SAT data is for the students compared to their peers. L. Chambers noted that generally the Seminar students have lower GPAs and SAT scores. She noted low honors student participation. B. Frakes asked if the ENGL 110 students are concurrently Inquiry Seminar students. L. Chambers said not necessarily.

R. Leary said that he has concerns that there could be an Inquiry Seminar trade-off with upper-level courses. He asked if we are we allowed to mandate training for the courses.

B. Frakes asked if the 82% number is for students in both an Inquiry Seminar and ENGL 110/111 versus all 1st years (73%). L. Chambers said yes.

B Sweet noted that the proposal would take effect for Fall 2018 and said that if that is so then we need to really ramp up course offerings. L. Chambers agreed and said she would hope that the transition year would allow for that. B Frakes asked if there will be penalties for under-enrolled or costly courses. T.Pfannestiel interjected and stated that there no scorecards any longer and stated that even the most expensive person teaching at the university can break even at 25 students.

K. McIntyre asked if there was a way to link the Seminars and programs such as the Siefert Series. L. Chambers stated that it could be if there was a way to make such links fit the goals of the program.

J. Phillips asked for input from those with experience with Inquiry Seminars. E. Foster said that she thinks it is interesting how interest in the courses develops. She said she thinks the students sell the courses to one another. S. Boyden noted she is teaching her first one right now but added that she was part of the group that got training and so forth on the seminars. She said that she does worry about the ability to drum-up support from the faculty to participate. Y. Ayad stressed that the training is essential. R. Lane noted that top universities all over the country do programs such as this and suggested that they work because of faculty buy-in. He said that the programs are key in forging bonds between faculty and students. J. Lyle stated that while he had no direct experience with the Seminars he had been informed of disinterested from a number of honors students because they didn’t see the value of the course, which could impact the idea that students sell the program to one another. L. Chamber said that she thinks there has been programmatic learning from 2015 to 2016 which is making a difference. J. Touster said that he generally favors the idea but added that he had heard that the original cohort was coerced into taking the courses. J. Touster suggested that the retention focus could be a problem because if that data doesn’t correspond then other values of the program could be lost in the rationale discussion.

D. Clark asked if there was data about impact of the 1st year flag when it as adopted. R. Leary said there was not because this form of assessment wasn’t on radars at that point. R. Skunda noted that he had a Seminar and stated that he liked it and felt it worked. J. Phillips that he has taught 4 sections and what he learned is that he needed to do a better job as a teacher in terms of information literacy which he said he has been working on improving. He also said he realized he didn’t know how to teach teamwork. J. Phillips said he thinks we need to learn how to do this, we need to bump retention, and we need to not get stuck in outdated mindsets about how to teach. He then said we need a motion for sending the data and proposal to CCPS (P. Woodburne motioned, B. Frakes seconded). CCPS will be tasked for giving a positive or negative recommendation and plan for going forward. R. Leary asked if CCPS had to use the existing proposal; J. Phillips said it was simply a starting point. The motion passed unanimously.

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