



Faculty Senate Meeting

MINUTES

October 13, 2022

3:15 p.m.

Zoom Meeting ID: 485 536 1551

Attendance: Charles Bell, Julie Bezzerides, Soo Lee Bruce-Smith, Jenna Chambers, Fred Chilson, Jennifer Cromer, Marlowe Daly-Galeano, Celeste Ellis, Martin Gang (guest), Justene Garner, Rachelle Genthos, Kristy Gonder, Andrew Hanson, Sue Hasbrouck (Chair), Thomas Hill, Leif Hoffmann, Lorinda Hughes, Billy Lemus, Seth Long, Angela Meek, Michelle Pearson-Smith, Cynthia Pemberton, Cecily Puckett, Suzanne Rousseau, Jenny Scott, Eric Stoffregen, Luke Thomas, Ian Tippetts, Heather Van Mullem

I. Call to Order *3:15 pm*

A motion was made to leave specific names off of meeting minutes, since meeting minutes are public documents. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously, with one abstention.

II. Minutes from the September 22, 2022 Faculty Senate were approved as read.

III. Updates: President Pemberton—Overview of October 19 SBOE Presentation.

Students from various disciplines will address the Board as part of a student panel. Representatives from the PSO, CSO and some faculty will participate in the employee panel. The President will then give the Institutional Progress Report. The President shared that about half of the board members are new and the President's plan is to educate the Board so they have a good understanding of LC's niche and the population we serve. Enrollment trends will also be highlighted. Enrollment has been declining for about the last 10 years, but we are above our 6-year average and are rebounding. Our current retention rate is about 63%; the goal is to hit 70% retention. The President plans to discuss events completed as well as plans for continued efforts of recruitment and retention. The President also briefly discussed the tuition increase that would be needed to fund a 1% CEC increase.

Question: Will the new abortion laws be a topic of discussion at the SBOE meeting?

President: The memo sent out earlier by administration is all that we have to follow at this time. Please ensure you are operating within the Board's policy on Academic Freedom.

IV. Campus Guest—Marty Gang, Director of IT/CTO—Overview of MS Teams.

An overview of Microsoft Teams was presented. All employees with an @lcsc.edu email address have a Teams license. Please see the Faculty Senate Team (under “Files”) to view the document titled “Faculty Senate Meeting – IT Notes” for an overview of Teams.

To join the discussion board to learn more about Microsoft Teams, open Teams and search “Teams Training and Discussion.” Click “join” and participate in the discussion thread.

Clarification: Faculty and staff will still have the opportunity to use Zoom, especially for those who interact with students often. The use of basic versus full licenses are being considered and communication has taken place between deans, supervisors, etc.

The “intranet” software is old and at end-of-life, and is planned to be decommissioned. The plan is for the data to go to cloud-based locations like Teams or Sharepoint. Redwood is also at end-of-life. Drives are starting to fail; plan to get these files moved to Alder before big issues arise.

Question from senator: Will we be able to access Teams when traveling abroad? Answer (Marty): Once we have the multifactor authentication process in place and you are not traveling to a country that is currently blocked (due to high level of hacker risk), then yes.

V. Old Business—WSU Ombuds (Sheri Glaesman) scheduled for Nov. 10 Faculty Senate meeting.

Chair indicated she planned to open this meeting up to other members of the campus (for example, PSO and CSO), so they could view this presentation. This means the November 10 meeting will also be held via Zoom, in order to allow for participation of other individuals beyond Senate.

VI. New Business

A. Nominations to Gen Ed Committee due October 31.

Two nominations for the Gen Ed Committee vacancy have been received so far. Senators were asked to please get any other nominations to faculty leadership by Oct. 31st. As soon as these are received, leadership will work with IR&E to develop a Qualtrics poll similar to that sent out to Association last fall, to complete the election.

B. Framework for review of Operational Guidelines (Policy 1.102).

The Chair’s goal is to complete a review of Policy 1.102 (Operational Guidelines) this year, with an eye toward: 1) performing some housekeeping items (such as defining web-coordinator role); 2) balancing workload among standing committees, and 3) considering the continued relevance of certain sections of this document. The hope is to present a strike-and-delete version of proposed amendments to Policy 1.102 at either the November or December Faculty Senate meeting.

Before undertaking this endeavor, the Chair asked that Senate indulge in a review Policy 1.104, Constitution of the Faculty of Lewis-Clark State College, in order to provide some reference points and a framework for the revision of the operational guidelines (Policy

1.102). A copy of the Faculty Constitution was made available in the Teams meeting folder but is also accessible in the College's Policies and Procedures Manual (<https://www.lcsc.edu/media/2268/1104-constitution-accessible.pdf>). Article II of the constitution defines the specific responsibilities of the faculty; comments offered during review of these responsibilities are summarized below.

Section 1 (Standard for Admission)—The first section of Article II states “The Faculty, in concert with the Director of Admissions/Registrar, shall establish minimum standards for admission to the College and its various units.” The Chair observed that, heretofore faculty appear to have had limited involvement with the development of institution-wide admission policies (Policies 5.202 Domestic Admission Standards and 5.207 Graduate Admission Standards). When administration was asked why this was the case, the response was: 1) in the case of the graduate admissions standards, it was assumed that involvement of program-specific faculty would be sufficient; 2) in the case of undergraduate admission standards, future revisions to the undergraduate admissions policy would include review-level authority for the faculty.

Discussion/Comment: There is a committee responsible for admission standards into the BSN undergraduate program.

Section 2 (Academic Standards)—Section 2 of Article II states “The Faculty shall establish academic standards to be maintained by all students in the College and its various units.” The Chair noted that many divisions have established minimum academic standards within their own divisions/programs.

Discussion/Comment: One senator noted that their division has a handbook that lays out standards to be maintained in that division.

Section 3 (Courses, Curricula, Graduation Requirements, Degrees)—Section 3 designates faculty responsibility for establishing and approving courses, curriculum, graduation requirements and degrees. The Chair noted that she felt faculty were generally meeting their responsibilities in this area, vis-à-vis Curriculum Committee and (for example) the requirement for Association's approval of the graduation list each spring.

Section 4 (Scholarships, Honors, Awards, Financial Aid) The Chair commented that she felt that faculty generally do have input into the principles related to awarding of scholarships, but that the Financial Aid Office exercises authority over the allocation of such awards. With regard to honors, the Chair noted that an institutional policy exists for approved honor cords/graduation regalia (Policy 5.308), but faculty currently do not have review-level authority on this policy.

Discussion/Comment: The Provost indicated that honor cords/stoles may again be a topic of discussion in the future. The current policy, as written, states honor cords and stoles should be academic in nature (i.e., not to be used to honor athletics), but there is a request to have a special cord/stole for athletes. One senator noted that we just went through a discussion of honor cords for athletes a few years ago.

Section 5 (Conduct of Students) —The Chair noted that the Student Code of Conduct is codified both in the Student Handbook as well as in institutional policy (Policy 5.105), and that faculty are listed as reviewers on this policy. Further, faculty have representation on the institutional Hearing Board; therefore, it was felt this area of responsibility was generally being met.

Section 6 (Student Participation on Faculty Committees)—Chair noted that this responsibility was unequivocally being met, given student representation on both Faculty Senate and the standing committees of Faculty Senate.

Section 7 (Selection of Administrative Officers)—Section 7 stipulates that faculty shall assist the SBOE in the selection of the President, and the President in the selection of administrative officers. The Chair pointed out that the language in this section implies an advisory role only; further, faculty are frequently involved in search committees for administrative positions; therefore, this area of responsibility would also seem to be met.

Section 8 (Governance of Divisions)—Section 8 stipulates that faculty shall establish general standards to guarantee their rights to participate in the governance of their respective divisions and the selection of their division chairs. The Chair noted that generally this responsibility would seem to be met, given that divisions meet regularly to decide matters of importance to them, and because division chairs are typically chosen from among the faculty in a particular division.

Section 9 (Faculty Welfare)—Section 9 states “The Faculty, through the Faculty Senate and other standing Faculty committees, shall select a standing committee to establish criteria for salaries, working conditions, benefits, appointments, promotion, tenure, dismissal, academic freedom, leaves, and related matters, insofar as they are not in conflict with Idaho SBOE policy, and shall, in concert with the Provost, provide for a program of Faculty development.”

The Chair noted that there is a lot included in Section 9, such that we are likely not fulfilling this responsibility entirely. The Faculty Affairs Committee fields many of these identified tasks (for example, when reviews of promotion/tenure/sabbatical criteria occur, and in providing for a program faculty development in conjunction with the Provost), but some of the remaining elements (salaries, working conditions, benefits, appointments) aren’t necessarily addressed regularly by any specific standing committee of Senate. While faculty are represented on the institutional Compensation Review Committee (CRC), it is solely through the Chair and Chair-Elect. Therefore, it may be appropriate to consider whether some of the unaddressed tasks could be assigned to a standing committee such as Budget, Planning and Assessment, when reviewing our operational guidelines.

Section 10 (Budget)—Section 10 states the faculty shall participate in budgetary matters at both the division and college level, and that it is “expected that the President will seek

advice and counsel from the Faculty on budgetary policies.”

The Chair noted this language would again imply an advisory role only for faculty, and that is role is likely being currently met through BPAC’s involvement with the institutional UAR/RRF process. Faculty provide input annually to the President through this process.

Section 11 (Organization of the College)—This section states that the faculty shall “advise and assist” the President and the SBOE in “establishing, reorganizing, or discontinuing administrative and academic units of the College.” This language also alludes to advisory role only. The Chair also pointed to the Provost’s forthcoming survey on reorganization outcomes.

Section 12 (Committee Structure)—Section 12 establishes the requirement that faculty maintain standing and special committees necessary for internal governance. The Chair noted that she again feels this responsibility is unequivocally being met, though it is getting more difficult to find faculty willing to serve in leadership roles and on the standing committees of Senate.

The Chair asked for further discussion; one senator simply noted that there were spelling errors in the constitution. The Chair also pointed to an inconsistent reference within the document itself (Article II Section 12 alludes to a nonexistent Article IV), but also noted that any revisions to the Faculty Constitution must be approved by the Idaho State Board of Education.

VII. Standing Committee Reports

A. Faculty Affairs—Jenny Scott

Recommendations were submitted to the Provost for fall Faculty Development Grant awards. If funded, the grants would require about \$1,000 more than half of the available funding (about \$11,000 of the \$20,000 annual budget), so a little less than half will be available to allocate in spring. Even though the grant application has been revised, there were still errors and omissions on the applications that were submitted. Please remind colleagues in division meetings to follow the directions on the application. There are six sabbatical applications and ranking of those applications will take place sometime this month. Workload within the committee is being evaluated as part of the operational guidelines review.

Question from senator: Broadly speaking, do we have money to fund sabbaticals?

Provost: Yes, there is funding in place (roughly \$30,000) and how much is required will depend on length of the sabbatical application.

Question from senator: For faculty who are awarded a Faculty Development Grant, gaining access to these funds seems a bit messy. What should we do to avoid taking the financial burden on ourselves personally?

Provost: There seems to be a disconnect between our established practices for using these funds and faculty understanding of how to access them. The most important thing is that you need to keep your division chair involved when applying for Faculty Development grants, and that you follow the College's procedures (for example, by completing a Travel Authorization) before incurring any personal expenses. We can add some language to the Academic Affairs Faculty Development Grant website that adds clarity, to avoid future mishaps. However, please be sure to include your division chair (as a cc) in any email communications regarding Faculty Development grants.

B. Student Affairs—Lorinda Hughes

Student Affairs is still working on revising the SCE question set. We are focusing on narrowing down the number of questions from the approximately twenty questions that now exist. Please encourage your divisions to provide feedback through their Student Affairs representative. We will have one more meeting before the end of the month.

C. Curriculum—Billy Lemus (No report)

D. Budget, Planning & Assessment—Sue Hasbrouck

Budget, Planning and Assessment met on September 27, and was given an update on possible realignment of duties in connection with the operational guidelines review. BPAC will develop an RRF (Resource Request Form) to formalize the sabbatical funding request and send it forward to the full Senate in time to be considered, before the RRF submission deadline.

VIII. Good of the Order

- Oct. 27 Faculty Senate meeting cancelled—next meeting will be Nov. 10. Also, please start thinking about nominees for Chair-Elect. The School of Professional Studies will have chaired Faculty Senate Association for three consecutive years, by the time Jenny completes her term—other schools, please step up.
- Angela Meek: Winter Revels will return as it has existed traditionally (games, food, spirits, fun and giveaways). Please plan to eat, drink and be merry with the rest of campus on Friday December 9th from 4-6 p.m.
- Provost: Received a draft for re-organization survey. Will share with chairs.
- Oct 24th SAC 112 – Climate Change Skepticism topic. Please attend!

IX. Adjournment 5:00 pm. Michelle Pearson-Smith moved to adjourn.