



Faculty Senate Meeting

MINUTES

September 8, 2022

3:15pm

Zoom Meeting ID: 485 536 1551

Present: Charles Bell, Julie Bezzerides, Jenna Chambers, Fredrick Chilson, Jennifer Cromer, Kacey Diemert, Celeste Ellis, Justene Garner, Rachelle Genthos, Kristy Gonder, Sue Hasbrouck, Thomas Hill, Leif Hoffmann, Lorinda Hughes, Brian Kolstad, Billy Lemus, Samuel Seth Long, Michelle Pearson-Smith, Mike Owen, Nina Peterson, Cecily Puckett (ASLCSC), Suzanne Rousseau, Jenny Scott, Eric Stoffregen, Luke Thomas, Heather Van Mullem.

- I. Call to Order 3:15pm
- II. Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from April 28, 2022: *motion made by Leif Hoffman, second by Jennifer Cromer. Unanimous approval.*
- III. Comments/Updates

A. Provost's Report (*Promotion reminders; Academic Affairs re-org survey; accreditation*)

- **Provost Chilson:** *A note, the president is unavailable, sends her regards. Provost's update item 2: An academic affairs reorganization survey is underway and will be shared soon. Goal is to ensure we are "structurally sound;" administration is looking for faculty feedback to ensure faculty feel supported. Expect this in the next week or so.*
- *Item 3, Accreditation update: we are moving forward in accreditation process. Changes required: we need to report on closing the assessment loop. Plan is to utilize President's Council as a venue for accreditation assignments; expect some assignment of Senators to some subcommittees to be forthcoming. Thank you [faculty] for your service and willingness to participate.*
- *Item 1, Promotion and tenure: A challenge we have had this year is that documentation of hire dates and other info has been maintained by three different areas, which presents the opportunity for inconsistencies. Record alignment is being verified and the goal is to centralize this process to eliminate future inconsistencies.*

Eric Stoffregen: *Should we reach out if we were expecting to be up for promotion and tenure? Answer: Provost Chilson – yes, please do.*



B. Chair's Report (*updates from President's Cabinet, Gen Ed Committee nominee*)

- **Sue Hasbrouck:** Report on President's Cabinet topics: Idaho State Board of Education will meet on campus on October 19th and 20th. Some faculty may be asked to help represent the College at this meeting. Institutional budget requests for the coming year have been capped at 3%. Most of the incremental funding would be consumed by things like benefit increases and change in employee compensation. At this point, expect fairly flat budgets for the upcoming year.
- **Item 2, Gen Ed Committee:** We have a vacancy on General Education Committee. A nominee (Kacey Diemert), has been identified, but if divisions also wish to advance nominations, they are encouraged to do so. Gene Straughan has agreed to continue serving as chair of the Hearing Board.
- **Reminder to Senate:** Please remember that your duty as a Senator is not only to represent your division, but also to take information back to your divisions.

IV. Old Business (None at this time)

Chair's note: Due to staff turnover in the administrative office tasked with maintaining the online Policies & Procedures manual, many of the policy revisions approved by Senate last year are not yet reflected in the online version of this document. Administration has been advised of this circumstance and has ensured us that the website will be updated.

V. New Business

[Clarification from the Chair: we are not voting on anything today. We will discuss the proposed policy revisions today, and defer voting to a subsequent meeting.]

A. Sabbatical Policy Revisions—Round 1

Provost Chilson: *The proposed revision to the existing policy on sabbaticals [Policy 2.114] includes minor language changes. I have to look at things from both the faculty perspective as well as the institution's perspective (how the legislature or State Board of Education may look at the policy.) I have worked with faculty leadership to identify language that precludes political pushback. After collaboration, the verbiage that you see in the proposed revision is what I would like you to consider as we move forward.*

Jenny Scott: *Faculty Affairs met yesterday. The suggestion that came out of this committee meeting is to remove the term "self-renewal" and replace it with "professional renewal." The committee further recommended modifying existing references to travel to read "professional travel." Jenny noted that other institutions (ISU, BSU, U of I) do not utilize the phrase "self-renewal" in their respective policies. Some Faculty Affairs committee members still felt this was important to include; the phrase "professional renewal" seemed an appropriate compromise that would still capture the purpose of sabbatical. Rubric changes were also reviewed. The timeline reference to SBOE notification of sabbaticals has been*



removed, as this requirement no longer exists. Jenny then shared sister-institution policy language describing sabbaticals, none of which use the term “self-renewal.”

Sue Hasbrouck: *We can bring this back to discuss further in a week or two. Encourage your division members to continue work on their sabbatical applications, but perhaps review the verbiage used.*

Leif Hoffman: *Clarification from the Provost please: what is the timeline related to this policy revision? Are we aiming to implement it this year? Deferring implementation until next-year would avoid the short turn-around associated with the application deadline.*

Provost Chilson: *Our goal is to offer sabbaticals this year. The October 1 deadline remains in place. Please work toward this, with the caveat that we may allow some flexibility. I don't want to put the institution at political risk due to verbiage. The long-run goal is to work together to come up with mutually-agreeable language, including a review of the Boyer model. Another goal is to ensure all faculty feel they have access to sabbaticals. For example, CTE has (to my knowledge) never received a sabbatical. I want to ensure all have the opportunity.*

Leif Hoffman: *Additional clarification: so we do not have to be held to the October 1 deadline?*

Provost Chilson: *There is flexibility with the deadline.*

Eric Stoffregen: *Was the term “professional renewal” discussed as just a term change or is it still meant to mean the same thing? Secondly: are we just “wordsmithing” or are we changing our definition of the “renewal” expectations?*

Provost Chilson: *If the President had to go and justify sabbaticals to the legislature, it is assumed that your sabbatical is in relation to your specialty/profession. This language change will help to support the idea that you are working toward professional renewal. Nothing has changed with regard to the expectation of the word “renewal.”*

Sue Hasbrouck: *Our policies are public documents. Some political viewpoints may find our current language politically unacceptable. Changing terms may aid in continued allowance of sabbaticals.*

Jenny Scott: *With the stated risk to legislative funding, we need to remove “self-renewal.” In regards to the rubric/ranking system, during previous rounds of sabbatical rankings, I automatically gave every application 20 points for self-renewal because I felt it was an automatic/built-in benefit, but others didn't automatically award these points. The opportunity for faculty renewal still exists, regardless of the term used to describe it.*

Mike Owen: *Noted that there have actually been two CTE sabbaticals this century (one in 2003 and the last, 5-6 years ago). Since these are competitive, in the past CTE and the academic side each had their own separate budget for sabbaticals.*



Provost Chilson: *Unsure of two separate budgets, but I will find out if two budgets currently exist.*

Charles Bell: *When hired, I was told CTE faculty were not eligible to apply for sabbaticals.*

Mike Owen: *BTS's aim is to meet this month to see if we can plan for taking sabbaticals (coverage for classes/teaching)*

Provost Chilson [to Mike Owen]: *Let's coordinate before you meet.*

Leif Hoffmann: *Our division is very concerned with the proposed verbiage changes. It sounds like the proposed revisions are really designed to protect us from incorrect interpretation by the legislature. However, we should ask ourselves: what is our job? It is to educate. Do we need to educate the legislature on the root of sabbaticals? Our concern is that if we change the language, we will lose the meaning. I think we need to have "professional development" defined to include "self-renewal" as a component.*

Provost Chilson: *I understand, I don't have issues with that. I don't want to put faculty at risk to lose out on the opportunity for sabbatical. BSU had funding cut because of something similar, that that may or may not have been done.*

Rachelle Genthos: *At our first division meeting, we had discussion around the Boyer model. We need a little more direction from the Provost. How might the Boyer model be implemented? Research seemed to be an emphasis of this model, and teaching was mentioned last.*

Provost Chilson: *A positive aspect of the Boyer model is that it emphasizes flexibility. I'm not sold on the Boyer model, but it provides a starting point. It is a generally-accepted model that is inclusive for all disciplines.*

Sue Hasbrouck: *If everyone is comfortable with the proposed revision, we can go ahead and vote on it at our next meeting. If not, we can look at a full re-work and keep our current policy in place this year.*

Provost Chilson: *Yes, good recap.*

Jenny Scott: *Clarification: Faculty Affairs plans to meet in October, but does not plan to explore this subject further, unless necessary.*

Sue Hasbrouck: *Senators, take this back to your divisions—we will discuss more at the next meeting.*

Leif Hoffmann: *Clarification: Faculty can still submit applications under the old model this round?*



Provost Chilson: Yes.

Sue Hasbrouck: Clarification: Per institutional Policy 1.100, until the President signs off on a new policy, the old policy remains in effect.

Lorinda Hughes: Is this the only wording we are working for this round?

Provost Chilson: Yes.

Lorinda Hughes: Why bother amending a few words if a complete overhaul is planned?

Sue Hasbrouck: We were initially under the impression that it would be needed to support sabbatical approval in the interim.

Eric Stoffregen: Do people get notified if they are eligible for sabbaticals?

Provost Chilson: Unsure, we need to check with the staff.

Lorinda Hughes: In the past, interested applicants contacted the Provost's office to see if you were eligible.

Provost Chilson: If helpful, I will send out an email that notifies the faculty of the opportunity to apply before the Oct. 1 deadline.

B. Performance Evaluation Policy Revision [**Policy 2.112**]

Sue Hasbrouck: In retrospect, this perhaps should have gone through the Faculty Affairs Committee. However, at the request of the Provost, I worked on this over summer. The proposed revision is to change the submission deadline for faculty performance evaluations to be earlier in the year for anyone who is pursuing promotion, so that the Provost has them available in time for his recommendation to the President on promotions. The specific revision is to move the deadline for performance evaluations to an earlier date (submitted by January 15th, review done by division chairs by the 25th). This would allow the Provost to have access to the most current year's performance evaluation, if needed. The dates listed at the end of the evaluation form were also revised to reflect the change.

Provost Chilson: There is a timing issue between faculty performance evaluation and faculty promotion. Faculty get to use their portfolio all the way to submission (January). The problem is, the portfolio is then not supported by the most current evaluation. In my opinion, the portfolio and the evaluation should be submitted in the same year.

Leif Hoffman: This is a solution trying to find a problem. If we are going to make the change in Policy 2.112, then we will be in violation of Policy 2.106. By policy, we submit the candidate statement and portfolio by Oct. 4th. This proposed revision presents the opportunity for an evaluation being referenced that we [the faculty member] did not review/discuss/explore in the other steps of the promotion process.



Provost Chilson: You make a lot of good points. However, I want to include the most current information and provide an opportunity for faculty to represent themselves accurately. Overwhelmingly, this revision will work in favor of the faculty member going up for promotion.

Leif Hoffman: You would not go up for tenure/promotion with a half-way decent portfolio. This evaluation doesn't get lost, it would simply be used on the next or future promotion application. The fear is that this will only be used to negatively impact promotion recommendations.

Sue Hasbrouck: Isn't it the case that faculty could still appeal promotion recommendations regardless? Faculty who feel they have a grievance in the promotion process can still go back to the institutional promotion committees (STPRC and SPRC) to supply more information. There's always opportunity to provide support/materials in the case of a contested promotion recommendation.

Leif Hoffman: Yes, but this is for the existing portfolio. Now if we add the newest evaluation, the candidate did not get the opportunity to defend.

Lorinda Hughes: There may not be another round (if you have reached terminal rank).

Leif Hoffman: There is still a performance review required every 5 years.

Sue Hasbrouck: Please take this back to your divisions for discussion.

C. Faculty Ombudsperson Proposal/Discussion

Sue Hasbrouck: Administration asked me what we would think about having a faculty ombudsperson. At many institutions, this position provides a resource for faculty and other staff to turn to before a problematic situation turns into a full-on "grievance." At other institutions, the ombudsperson typically reports to the President. Owing to his familiarity, Sue asked Gene Straughan to discuss some details concerning the role of an ombudsperson.

Eugene Straughan: I raised this question because, the grievance process is pretty formal, where there is usually a pretty clear winner and loser. We may not be the right institution for this, but the way that I see this role (usually a retired person) is provides opportunity for a more informal process. The ombudsperson is more of a mediator of conflict. I believe that a lot of these conflicts/disagreements are due to misunderstandings; the ombudsperson may be a good way to identify misunderstandings and avoid conflicts. They work with faculty, staff, and student complaints. I have a colleague that has this position at WSU, she could inform us of some details. End point: This role could serve as a counselor, mediator, educator on a variety of topics, and help to avoid the formal grievance process.

Mike Owen: Didn't we historically have an ombudsperson?



Harold Crook: *My impression is that we don't need one often, but when we do they are helpful. I would be in favor of this if we have a well trained and "the right person." Otherwise, it might be a hinderance.*

Provost Chilson: *Administration believes it is an interesting idea. We could move forward on this, but have questions—would we be able to have a full-time paid position? Probably not.*

Sue Hasbrouck: *Reviewed WSU's description of the ombudsperson function (found on their website). If this was a paid position, it would likely be targeted during budget cuts.*

Leif Hoffmann: *The Hearing Board had a very strong position that an ombudsperson would be helpful. Having one in place could have resolved an issue historically, if someone had just been available to listen. Perhaps this could be a volunteer position. When I was Faculty Senate chair, and I was serving on the Hearing Board, I found those roles to sometimes conflict; having an ombudsperson would've been helpful.*

Rachelle Genthos: *I think it's a great idea. I would have used an ombudsman half a dozen times and would have encouraged students to do the same. I support this idea.*

Sue Hasbrouck: *Administration would be receptive to this. If you have ideas with how to proceed, please reach out to me. Perhaps we start by drafting a position description.*

VI. Standing Committee Reports

A. Faculty Affairs ([Jenny Scott](#))

Second piece of sabbatical policy: we will look at the Boyer model later this year or perhaps Spring, to identify relevant parts that might be adopted.

Reminder: Faculty Development grant applications are due on October 1st. There are some updates on the websites; please review it. We have language clarifications and an updated form on the website that Faculty Affairs Committee members suggested.

One committee member pointed out that Faculty Affairs used to be two different committees: Faculty Development and Faculty Affairs. We may wish to revisit this model.

A topic our committee was asked to explore is whether the "phased retirement" option still exists, or if that was offered only in conjunction with budget cuts.

B. Student Affairs ([Lorinda Hughes](#))

Student Affairs Committee has already met; the focus was on the actual questions that are included on our SCEs: what's there, what needs to be adjusted. Division representatives on Student Affairs were asked to carry these questions back to their respective divisions.



C. Budget, Planning & Assessment (*Sue Hasbrouck*)

BPAC plans to meet at the end of September. Members will be asked to attend UARs and provide input on the annual report that Faculty Senate authors with regard to resource requests.

D. Curriculum (*Billy Lemus*)

Curriculum Committee met on Tuesday and went over introductions/policies. Currently trying to bring new members up to date on curriculum and policies. Will meet again on the 20th.

VII. Good of the Order

New Policies:

- 1.113 Conflict of Interest (*Sue: if you receive NIH or PHS grants, this may apply to you, so please review it*).
- 5.207 Graduate Admission

Next meeting: September 22, 2022—LIVE MEETING (ACW 134) – *update/correction from original agenda. Sue encourages you to attend in-person if you are able.*

Leif Hoffman: *Next week on Thursday September 16 in SAC 115, there will be a presentation about parenting, mask mandates, vaccines.*

Also Leif Hoffman: *Some of you may have seen that a documentary has been published about a colleague on campus. Question to Provost Chilson: How should faculty respond if we are approached by students/ colleagues?*

Provost Chilson: *Please just be aware of the situation. On August 26th, many people received an anonymous email making accusations against a faculty member, and stating that a documentary would be released on Hulu. Over the last week and a half or so the administration has received and responded to a variety of emails/social media requests regarding this matter. Our official response is "LC State cannot comment on personnel matters." The alleged conduct was to have occurred well before the faculty member was hired at LC. Ensure students that we will work with them as needed to drop/switch classes.*

Jenny Scott: *CTL session—Peter Remien will be leading a workshop on writing successful applications for faculty development grants and sabbaticals.*

VIII. Adjournment

4:50 pm Move to adjourn (Mike Owen), second Harold Crook (second).