



Faculty Senate Meeting MINUTES

March 14, 2024 | 3:15 p.m. | **ACW 136**

Zoom Meeting ID: 911 863 9554 <https://lscs.zoom.us/j/9118639554>
(for those working remotely)

Attendance: Jenny Scott, Rodney Farrington, Billy Lemus, Charles Bell, Eric Stoffregen, Gina Lott, Jenna Chambers, Jennifer Cromer, Jessica Savage, Katie Roberts, Kim Tuschhoff, Debra Lybyer, Leif Hoffmann, Lorinda Hughes, Peter Remien, Suzanne Rousseau, Celeste Ellis, Seth Long, Gene Straughan, Scott Wimer, Thomas Hill, Neto Garcia Rosales, Kristy Gonder, Provost Chilson

I. Call to Order

Welcome! This Faculty Senate meeting is called to order at 3:15pm.

II. Approval of Senate Meeting minutes from Feb. 22, 2024

Minutes have been posted to our website and linked from our calendar invite. Are there any corrections: Yes, two spelling errors in the housing discussion section. (*Compacity* to *capacity* and correct spelling of *Multnomah*).

Any further discussion? None.

Motion: Motion to approve minutes made by Jenna Chambers. Seconded by Katie Roberts. Motion passes to post with two stated corrections. Unanimous approval.

III. Announcements/Updates

- Provost Chilson
 - *We were notified by the SBOE that the Masters in Cyber Accounting was approved and we hope to have a quick turnaround if approved by Northwest.*
 - *Question from Senator: Any news about the floor GPA discussion from the previous meetings? Answer from Provost Chilson: No there has been nothing new on this subject.*
 - *Question: Did anything have to be approved for BTS to be reorganized? Answer from Provost Chilson: SBOE has approved and supported the reorganization.*

- Chair Scott
 - The Share & Shout rotation/weekly invites seem to be working! Check out the “Posts” page of the Intranet.
 - The CRC Report and President’s Response are available to view in the Intranet. The Report by the committee includes Appendices with data tables; the Response document does not have those included, although the President addresses points made with the Appendices in red lettering within the narrative. *In the past there used to be a table, this time she went into the body of the document to make comments.*
 - *Chair Scott highlights some of the main points. The committee was asked to look at specific benefits as focused initiatives this time around. Instructor salaries and Assistant Professor salaries are noted to be lower than peers and this is hard to fill these positions. Chair Scott also briefly highlights the red-font responses from the President found in the CRC Report-President Response.*
 - *Question from Senator: If we have more questions who should we ask? Response: The chair of the committee is Jenny Scott, so please direct questions her way.*

IV. Committee Reports

- A. Budget, Planning & Assessment (*Jenny Scott*). *See announcements above.*
- B. Curriculum (*Polly Knutson*) - *no news to share.*
- C. Faculty Affairs (*Peter Remien*) – *Met yesterday and ranked the faculty development grants. We will be forwarding recommendations to the Provost. We will meet one more time this year to discuss ranking processes and also how to encourage faculty participation in grants and sabbaticals.*
- D. Student Affairs (*Lorinda Hughes*) – *No new news. Question from senator: Do we have any new direction if we will be using new SCE’s or the old forms? Provost Chilson answers: He will follow up with Grace in IRE. Discussion ensues: it seems that participation will increase if we use the new version because the new evaluation is shorter in length. Provost Chilson also encourages faculty to set aside class time to complete SCE’s.*

V. Old Business

- A. (*recommendation*) CTE/BTS Senate/Committee representation due to restructure
 - 1. As reflected in the draft minutes, we have heard formally from current BTS members, BUCS, SOC SCI, and TEAM. Without forcing anyone, it would be ideal to hear from the other divisions, as well. NHS, PLMSS and HUM Senators: would you like to report anything from your Divisions on this topic?
-NHS Senator: Clarifying questions. Would you define “at large?” Also, BTS has to meet with CTE going forward. (Clarification- Each school is required

to meet once a semester.) We have had two BTS members join our division and feel representation might be better with an at-large position. Provost Chilson: I recommend there would be guidelines about selection criteria if at-large positions pass. That way there would not be over-representation of BTS members on Senate.

-Humanities Senator: Broad consensus that some sort of at-large representation would likely be best. This wasn't entirely clear in discussion, but this did seem to have the most support.

-PLMSS: We don't have any BTS members that have joined us, so we didn't have many responses in discussion. So just speaking as an individual: I would anticipate that BTS would represent Senate but might be hard to have to fill committee work.

-Comment from Senator: We used to have representation to fill committees. I would like to say that we (BTS) fear that we have been absorbed by larger groups and that we may disappear. Just to have BTS representation completely die is scary. .

-Comment from T&I: There should be some sort of representation. Would this be too burdensome for former BTS members? We would want to avoid that. There should be some BTS voice—maybe not two senators at-large but at least one voice. Some representation would be better than none.

-BUCS: It sounds like our former BTS folks that have been in our division a few years really didn't need more representation. It seemed they didn't have a recommendation to move forward. Computer Sciences is different than Business.

-Comment from Senator: (Mathematics). The BTS member we have isn't concerned. Math faculty recommend that guidelines of senators elected may need updated. Should we have a representative by each discipline?

-Comment from Senator: You may not want to be prescriptive but instead encourage participation from different disciplines. "Please serve and step forward."

-Chair Scott: I hope you feel we have given adequate time to discuss these options. But in the spirit of time, let's move forward.

-Comment from Senator alternate: Speaking on behalf of faculty with background of constitutional law, I've seen a lot of reorganization at LCSC. I understand change causes a riff for individuals. I do want to tell you that as these reorganizations happen, the interdisciplinary focus is very welcoming and concerns are shared in Faculty Senate. Also, a lot of the diversity within the division serves as a check and balance. We should be open to the difference dialogue that happens. When I thought about this, it reminded me of Congress and something that happened in the House of Representatives. If you think of the states as the division-- Guam, Virgin Islands, etc. have provided them with a delegate. They have a voice in the House of Representatives but not a vote. They can be members in committees and exercise a vote in committees.

Question from Senator: One argument that was brought up was that "as the rules stand right now, any faculty member can join the conversations

in Senate at any time. We are not a closed meeting.” My counter to this argument it would give a shout out and honor our colleagues by giving them this symbolic gesture [BTS at large position(s) with voice, without vote].

-Comment from Senator: It would be a collegial gesture that allows the Senate to be bureaucratically organized among divisions and an official voice at LCSC. This may not matter in 10 years, but it matters now.

-Chair Scott- How would you like to move forward?

2. Last time, we temporarily settled on three options:
 - a. No change in structure
 - b. 1 at-large
 - c. 2 at-large
 - d. OTHER?

3. This decision does not lie with the Senate; if any changes to policy are made, it would be up to the Faculty Association. While I don't recommend one specific option being formally voted on by the Senate, I think it would be good if we decided on two or three of these options to pass on to the Faculty Association in preparation for the April meeting. Prior to the April Faculty Association meeting, a preliminary step could be sending a poll to the members with the options to gauge what the faculty as a whole feel about this. Then, a formal vote could happen in April.

Comment from Senator: Have we looked at what our sister institutions do?

Provost Chilson comments: ISU has a school of business, education, funding is all separate. We toured community colleges and they seem to have a similar structure. We don't have a sister institution that is like ours so we have a model that incorporates universities and a community college structure.

Chair Scott: Let's add "Voice without a vote" to the list of options based on discussion and feedback today. Chair Scott writes the options on the board to facilitate a vote on what to do to move forward.

1. No change in faculty senate
2. 1 at-large in faculty senate
3. 2 at-large in faculty senate
4. Voice without vote in faculty senate

Discussion from Senator: We did not have the fourth option; can we take it back to our divisions for discussion?

Counter comment from Senator: I think we have the information we need, and we have discussed options. Again, we are not making a decision, just bringing a recommendation to faculty association.

*Peter Remien makes a motion for faculty senate to bring forward to faculty association to propose **no change** or **one at-large position for BTS members**. Jenna Chambers seconds this motion.*

Discussion: Comment from Senator: I recommend making an amendment of “no change and one-at large.” Should one-at large fail, we would like to replace this with a voice without vote” and now people might feel more comfortable, and this could pass with 2/3 vote.

Point of clarification of procedural technicalities reviewed with this discussion point.

Non-member comments: I believe “voice without a vote” already exists. That’s why I’m here today.

Comment from Senator: Should we wait to decide on this? Perhaps we should wait until the BTS members are fully integrated and perhaps may be fully comfortable.

Point of clarification: “No change” would mean there is no change to the operational guidelines. If you vote no, no change to the current structure of the Senate. If you vote yes, this means there will be one at- large.

Chair Scott repeats: Peter Remien makes a motion for Faculty Senate to bring forward to Faculty Association that we propose no change or one at large position for BTS members. Jenna Chambers seconds this motion. Vote:

Aye: 10; Oppose: 3; Abstentions: 3. Motion carries.

B. (action) Hearing Board upcoming vacancy (Senate-appointed)

- Division Chair Alternate: Jennifer Weeks’ term expires SP24. Jennifer is willing to renew unless there are other nominations. I reached out to all the Chairs but have not heard back. Would any of you like to nominate a Chair Alternate? Shall we table this until the April 11 meeting or move forward with renewing Jennifer’s term?

Leif Hoffman makes a motion to renew Jennifer Weeks’ term for Hearing Board Alternate. Seconded by Katie Roberts. Unanimous approval.

C. (action) Student Petitions Committee upcoming vacancy (Senate-appointed):

- Faculty member, Academic Programs: Leanne Parker’s term expires SP24 and she would like to renew for another 3-year term. Are there any other nominations? Shall we table this until the April 11 meeting or move forward with renewing Leanne’s term?

Leif Hoffman makes a motion to renew Leanne Parker's term on the student petitions committee. Seconded by Charles Bell. Unanimous approval.

VII. New Business

A. (discussion) Grade Scale

- UI/WSU have A/B/C with no +/-
- Impact on dual credit GPAs and equality of transfer students into programs

Presentation of information by Scott Wimer and Lorinda Hughes of NHS:

Discussion: My daughter goes to Lewiston High School. I went to a parent meeting at LHS and they were talking about AP classes and dual enrollment classes. A large number of students were taking dual enrollment courses. My daughter had a 92% which translated to an A-. If students are getting B- they may be getting as low as a 2.6 GPA and then they are not eligible for scholarships. So why are we doing this? I think for most cases this is a disadvantage. Also, with transfer students they may have inflated GPA scale?

Discussion: In the nursing program we want to encourage enrollment and the +/- scale hinders LC-state enrollment.

Comment: Dual Credit students are not given access to their WarriorWeb so they don't accidentally drop a course. They have the opportunity to call and get into WarriorWeb if need be.

Comment from Senator: We were clearly told that the grading scale needs to be included in our syllabus. The dual credit teacher or liaison is responsible for this. On a different issue with the +/- discussion our division (social sciences) the general consensus is that we need to keep this because we would lose students that are high performers.

Comment from Senator: LC State uses this grading scale per policy. It seems like there must be some disconnect between what we are doing and what is written in policy.

Moving forward: Kim Tuschhoff will ask the Idaho registrar counsel for the historical perspective. Scott Wimer will write up a proposal to help facilitate future discussion.

B. (discussion) Remaining 1-6 credits be allowed in Fall (instead of summer only) following eligibility to walk in May commencement

- Our current policy for seniors that have credits remaining at the time of May commencement is that they can walk in May if they have 6 or less credits and they can be completed in the summer term. Some faculty are questioning why this can't be pushed to the Fall term, given that the courses needed by not be offered in summer and thus would not be able to walk with their classmates.

-Comment from Kim Tuschhoff: This is really based off of the academic school year. There are a lot of deadlines and manual input required. This is why we have a late fee instituted (to help facilitate the last-minute scramble).

-Comment: The information on walking and graduation is in the catalogue. This means it could probably be re-written. This is not currently "policy" but rather "practice/procedural."

VIII. Good of the Order

- Next *Senate* meeting: April 11
- Next/final *Faculty Association* meeting: either April 18 or 25, dependent upon Senate needing the 25th as one last meeting for the year.
- April 6th-12 is the "Week of the Young Child." Our early-child development programs are putting on some events, more information will be forthcoming.

IX. Adjourn

Motion to adjourn made by Rodney Farrington, seconded by Katie Roberts.
Unanimous approval. 5:02pm.