



Faculty Senate Meeting

MINUTES

February 9, 2023

3:15 p.m. ACW 134

Zoom Meeting ID: 485 536 1551

Attendance: Charles Bell, Julie Bezzerides, Christina Brando-Subis, Soo Lee Bruce Smith, Jenna Chambers, Fred Chilson, Jennifer Cromer, Harold Crook, Justene Garner, Rachelle Genthos, Martin Gibbs, Kristy Gonder, Sue Hasbrouck, Thomas Hill, Leif Hoffmann, Lorinda Hughes, Billy Lemus, Seth Long, Luther Maddy, Mike Owen, Michelle Pearson-Smith, Peter Remien, Suzanne Rousseau, Jenny Scott, Eric Stoffregen, Luke Thomas, Heather Van Mullem

I. **Call to Order** 3:15 pm

II. **Meeting minutes** from December 8, 2022 Senate meeting unanimously approved.

Chair’s announcement: Peter Remien (Humanities) has graciously agreed to serve as the AY223-24 chair-elect. If divisions have other nominations for chair-elect, please submit them by February 23.

III. **Provost Chilson—Zero-Based Scheduling**

Provost Chilson briefly reviewed zero-based scheduling. In setting the schedule, we should assess course offerings and evaluate each for growth based on enrollment and waitlists each semester. For example, we have historically hired adjuncts to teach three separate courses with partial enrollment that could easily be rolled into one course. Region II enrollment is expected to decrease, so an option is to focus on how to appeal to adult learners (e.g., single-parents and/or working adults that need alternative times for courses). This will help us to become more fiscally responsible.

Questions?

Question from Senator: How is this different from the conversations we have each semester when determining the course schedule in our division?

Provost Chilson: If your division already practices a form of zero-based scheduling, that’s good. However, not all divisions currently employ this approach.

Question from Senator: It seems zero-based scheduling really deals with two factors: 1) which courses are being offered; 2) which times are these courses being offered. Is this correct?

Provost Chilson: Yes, these items are the motivation.

Question from Senator: Do we know which classes are going to be in high demand (i.e., skills versus academic degrees)? Will adult learners be able to pay for these courses?

Provost Chilson: We have an Adult Learning Coordinator responsible for recruiting adult learners and finding companies that will help pay their tuition.

Question from Senator: We are looking to offering more options for night, evening, and weekend classes. If enrollment is low, what would happen to the faculty agreeing to teach such course? Would they be reassigned duties?

Provost Chilson: Our breakeven number is 17.5 students per class. I understand that when a new course is initiated, it may take time to gain popularity/enrollment. We will let things play out over time and re-evaluate when appropriate.

Comment from Senator: Some of our technical students travel from the new CTE building to the main campus for their General Education classes. Reconsidering start times for classes would be appreciated.

Comment from Senator: Some adult learners are not always the strongest academically—now we have them showing up at an evening class after working a long day. I have concern for their success.

Provost Chilson: I think it's important to try all the options.

Question from Senator: Will IT support be available at these alternative course times? This is something important to consider. For example, will the Helpdesk remain open during evening hours?

Provost Chilson: IT has been supportive of this initiative so far.

Question from Senator: Does a dual-credit student still help satisfy the 17.5 break-even point?

Provost Chilson: Yes, this still applies. We have worked that into the financial equation.

Question from Senator: Are there suggestions for best times based on the non-traditional adult-learner population?

Provost Chilson: Yes, evenings/nights, and weekends. We intend to trial some of these and see which are well received. The virtual-remote option helps satisfy face-to-face contact.

IV. **Old Business**—Policy 1.102 Operational Guidelines for Faculty Governance

The chair reviewed items that had been changed from last version of document that was before Senate and why:

- Removed language that would've softened the requirement for standing committee chairs to keep minutes at their meetings (division objection);
- Insertion of the words "at least" in front of the secretary and web editor stipend amounts (division suggestion);
- Eliminating the proposed move of Faculty Affairs function #2 ("conduct a continuing study of salaries, professional problems, welfare, retirement practices and working conditions of

members”) to Budget, Planning & Assessment (division objection). Chair indicated she had proposed this solely in the interest of balancing workload among standing committees.

Comment from Senator: reassignment would not resolve workload issue. Faculty grants committee and faculty affairs committee used to be separate in the past. If we move this to the Budget and Planning Committee, that committee’s name or charge may need to be reconsidered.

Question from Senator: Why wouldn’t we separate the Faculty Affairs committee into two committees again?

Chair-elect: The Faculty Affairs committee talked about these items; some feel function #2 should stay with Faculty Affairs as there is more to that than just the budgetary aspect of faculty compensation. It also addresses retirement practices, working conditions, faculty welfare, etc. These are things that certainly would be appropriate with Faculty Affairs, and not BPAC. The Faculty Affairs committee was more concerned with keeping committees well-balanced and relevant. One thought was perhaps taking only the budget-related component and reassigning to BPAC. The current Faculty Affairs committee also considered the current workload. They do not feel overloaded with too much workload and would not recommend separating the current Faculty Affairs committee into two committees. If a busy year presents, then a subcommittee or something could be developed, but as of right now, no recommendation for separation has been made. There are generally two to three meetings in the fall (dealing with faculty development grants, sabbatical recommendations, and any other items to discuss), and two meetings in the spring (one for faculty development grants, and one for any other items to discuss).

*Senator then asked for a review of all the proposed changes to Policy 1.102—see **strike-and-delete version of policy 1.102, attached.***

Comment from Senator: When considering the operational guidelines, is it true that standing committees can’t be staffed with an instructor rank, rather based on faculty rank?

Chair: only certain committees (like STPRC or SPRC) require senior faculty rank--most standing committees, however, do not stipulate a “minimum” faculty rank.

Comment from Senator: Having STPRC talk to new faculty members about tenure and promotion opportunities would be beneficial. Perhaps we should make this is a requirement of new faculty orientation?

Motion from to keep Part III (Committees) Sections 5 and 6 (d), but remove (c). Subsection c states “in conjunction with the Provost’s office, notify in writing faculty who are eligible to apply for {tenure/promotion} or {promotion} and provide “Request for Tenure/Promotion Evaluation forms along with a list of contents required for the {Tenure/Promotion} or {Promotion} file.”

Comment from Senator: the words “will serve” are too proscriptive for web editor and secretary--recommend “shall serve” instead.

Chair: three-year term is stipulated for the web editor because of the training required.

Motion by Leif Hoffmann to accept the proposed revisions to Policy 1.102, as amended. Approved with one abstention.

V. New Business

A. Curriculum Proposals Requiring Senate Review

The chair reminded Senate that, per Policy 2.103 (Curriculum), Faculty Senate is charged with reviewing/approving proposals for new and/or expanded programs. She then turned the floor over to Billy Lemus, Chair of Curriculum Committee, to review the three proposals before Senate.

1. **HUM-MINOR:** Fine & Performing Arts

Chair Lemus: No new courses are being offered, just a repackaging of existing courses to fit into a new minor (hence no budget proposal required).

2. **ED-BABS:** Special Education

Chair Lemus invited Christina Brando-Subis to review the proposed new major in Special Education. Christina indicated this field is in high demand with a lot of student interest. Implementing this major would allow students to major in Special Education and take the state exam.

Question from Senator: Right now, what is the difference between someone who gets an elementary degree with the SPED endorsement and this new major?

Christina: The new major allows for more specialization. Graduates would be allowed to teach K-12 special education students and not have to take certain elementary education classes.

Question from Senator: How many less credits with the new degree? Christina: 6 less credits.

3. **Basic Technical Certificate:** Bookkeeping/Accounting

Chair Lemus indicated this certificate proposal is for those already working who would like an additional certification, using classes they are likely already taking. This is not a new program, but a re-packaging of existing courses; no budget review is therefore required.

Motion by Leif Hoffmann to approve all curriculum proposals as a slate. Seconded by Mike Owen. Approved with one abstention.

B. Revised SCE Survey Instrument

Lorinda Hughes, Chair of Student Affairs Committee, introduced the revised Student Course Evaluation (SCE) survey instrument developed by the Student Affairs committee and described the feedback received from students as part of a beta group.

Recommendation from Senator: separate the question "The instructor presents course material in an understandable and organized manner" into two separate questions. Doing so will improve data quality since these technically are two different questions.

Recommendation from Senator: Make sure the Qualtrics survey instrument allows for forward and backward navigation. Also clarify that clicking the final arrow at the end will result in submission of the survey.

Recommendation from Senator: This survey is in fact about evaluating the faculty/instructor—it does not evaluate the course. Consider name change.

Question from Senator: Does accreditation require SCE's? Senate Chair: No.

Recommendation from Senator: the question that reads "In the course I gained new knowledge, new skills, and/or a new perspective" is also problematic. There are really three questions being asked here, so accuracy of data is again a concern.

Recommendation from Senator: Syllabi must include learning objectives, etc. Can we remove the question related to learning objectives? This will help lower the number of questions on the SCE.

Motion by Senator: I would like to make a motion to remove the "competency" question.

The Chair at this point called for a summation and suggested that Senate revisit the revised SCE instrument at a future meeting, given the number of changes being recommended.

Comment from Senator: I like that we have a finalized form now to use in getting feedback.

The chair asked that comments be directed to Student Affairs committee division representatives or Lorinda Hughes. Vote on revised SCE instrument tabled for time being.

VI. Committee Reports

- Jenny Scott: Faculty Affairs will be meeting in a month to rank faculty development grant applications for spring. Please note the approaching deadline of March 1, for activities to be completed by Dec 31st, 2023.
- Sue Hasbrouck: Budget, Planning & Assessment Committee has been attending Functional Area Committee (FAC) reviews as faculty observers and we will be submitting our summary report to the President by next week.

VII. Good of the Order

- Emeritus nominations due to chair by 2/23/23. Prepare **no longer than a five-minute presentation** to be rendered at the March 9 Faculty Association meeting.
- Julie Bezzerides: the LCSC academic calendar uses the verbiage "Dead Week." Does this mean no chapter exams, no new content, no assessments of any kind? We need clarification to avoid confusion for both instructors and students. Alternatives: Keep term "dead week" but define it. Or eliminate the term and have a clear title like "no-final exam" week.
- Chair asked whether there would be interest in having the President attend one of the two remaining Faculty Senate meetings of the year and share her vision for corrections education. Senators indicated support for this idea.

VIII. Motion to adjourn by Michelle-Pearson Smith, second by Mike Owens (5:10 p.m.) approved.

ATTACHMENT 1

PROPOSED REVISION TO POLICY 1.102, OPERATIONAL GUIDELINES FOR FACULTY GOVERNANCE