

**Faculty Senate
Lewis-Clark State College
Approved Minutes**

3/21/19

3:15pm

SUB 143

Present: Leif Hoffmann, Amanda Van Lanen, LaChelle Rosenbaum, Julee Moore, Natalie Holman, Jennifer Weeks, Lynne Bidwell, JR Kok, Lori Stinson, Bryce Kammers, Susan Steele, Christa Davis, Nikol Roubidoux, Spencer Payton, Michelle D. Pearson-Smith, Carol Martin, Julie Bezzerides, Tracy Cook, Gary Mayton, Allen Schmook

Guests: Debra Lybyer, Lorinda Hughes, Grace Anderson

ALSCSC: Sam Weeks

I. Call to order @ 3:15

Motion to approve agenda by JR Kok, seconded by Lynne Bidwell, approved unanimously.

II. Introductions

III. Consent Agenda

Approval of minutes from 2/21/19

Natalie Holman needs to be added as present to 2/21/19 Senate minutes.

Motion to approve minutes with amendment by Lynne Bidwell, seconded, approved unanimously.

IV. Invited Reports/Institutional Committees

- **Nikol Roubidoux – Discuss a recommended change to the *Academic standing Policy***

Current policy as written was discussed and reviewed with the policy shown to senators. Currently students “linger in limbo” between warning and academic probation and they can go back and forth without academically progressing. The current three levels are “good, probation, and suspension.” The proposal is an effort to facilitate immediate response to motivate students in a forward academic direction.

New policy: GPA 2.0 or higher, otherwise “suspension” if the first semester falls below 1.0 or the students Cum GPA drops below 2.0. If a student returns they do not have to petition after their one semester of suspension, but they will have to maintain a minimum Cum GPA of 2.0 for the first semester. This policy is being brought for feedback in an effort to move toward administration proposal.

Financial aid implications questioned, but that is not known as that is a separate issue. Traditional loan repayment begins six months after a student is no longer enrolled. Those details need to be worked out with financial aid.

**Carol Martin requested that students from International Programs be considered differently, as this has the potential to influence student Visas and recruitment.

- **Jenni Light/Allen Schmook - Emeritus email account – what do faculty think about moving emeritus email from @lcsc.edu (this one requires payment) to @lcmail.lcsc.edu (free)? Would require a change in policy to do so.**

Last President’s council meeting discussion was on budgets, and the current email payment was discussed as it is a budget line item. The current policy manual for emeritus faculty gives privileges for multiple items, including continued email account and access. Allen Schmook is here to answer questions and continue the discussion from Faculty Affairs.

Context: LCSC holds a “Microsoft contract” that allows many things with this company (i.e.: moving from windows 7 to windows 10 without question for all LCSC

computers). The current Employee email system is also in this contract and paid for by a Microsoft formula which considers full & part time employees, and the number of students. Each lcsc.edu account is billed. Cost for each FTE is \$67.93, emeritus faculty are 1/3 of a FTE. There are 54 emeritus email addresses currently, which is approximately \$1225./year.

Questions: can lcsc.edu be forwarded to lmail.lcsc.edu as a concern was that people would lose their contacts.

Faculty Feedback: Social Sciences (LH) Some people think this is “a complete slap in the face” since faculty benefits and pay are already limited. 2nd thing is that this is \$100/month so does this cost equate to the blowback that would occur.

Donsam (JB) Active faculty doing research would be hard to contact.

Education (GM) reached out to emeriti faculty and the word “insulting” was mentioned with the thought of changing the process.

Jenni asks for feedback from each Division so she can summarize and forward that to administration. **Seeking decision for next Senate meeting April 4th.

- **Amanda Van Lanen - Compensation Review Committee**

Update includes that an interim report was submitted to the President two weeks ago. Recommendations had compression as a top ranking with strong arguments regarding market inequalities. Encouraged transparency and continued communication, so hoping this committee will continue throughout the year. Faculty put forward a plan to bring compressed faculty who have been here 15 years + to get up to 80% of peers over two years. Plans to address future compression by giving a 3.5% pay raise after successfully completing the five year review in addition to the 3% raise for cost of living (if given). Other things included flexible summer hours and a recommendation to allow two dependents to have LCSC tuition benefits at the same time.

Compensation philosophy idea was to provide a guide for how LCSC uses our money for compensation and wages. First line is that we have to follow SBOE code, and our concern on campus is addressing compression and wages. Clarify that bumps from one level to the other on campus currently are covered by tuition increases not State appropriations.

- **Jennifer Weeks & Amanda Van Lanen / Jenni Light – Leadership institute see vision for institute here: https://drive.google.com/file/d/1s_vFb7tpC05-DdLsuJ-WTFNBEaguRfNP/view?usp=sharing please solicit feedback from your divisions. Please send feedback to Rachel Jameton rajameton@lcsc.edu or Jenni Light jlight@lcsc.edu**

Current LCSC Professional Development Training (PDT) on leadership has been geared toward staff and professional staff. This opportunity is focused on faculty.

Jennifer Weeks shared her opportunity to be part of two leadership institutes. CTE 20-month program was first and they met four times a year. Best thing was making contacts across the state. Also had to be part of the ACTE, and attended two of those sessions. National policy was observed at DC. The best opportunity within the State division was talking about policy and procedures that affect her directly. Previously attended one (of three tracks) through PDT which helped make campus contacts. Favorite was on understanding of procedures, and the history of LCSC. Recommends being the Chair of a Faculty Committee as the most educational experience for leadership.

Natalie Holman shared her opportunity with emerging leaders program in DC with faculty from across the country and projects throughout the year. Felt that meeting other faculty and learning about other academic institutions was valuable. Sessions on personal growth, team building, and college budgets was also helpful to understand how a higher education institution works and the decisions are made to in an effort to produce constructive solutions.

Jenni Light shared the current idea for the “leadership institute.” The institute would have a two-year timeframe. The first year would offer classes and the second year would be a competitive acceptance and would include mentoring, experience with SBOE, legislature, and possibly other institutions. Additionally there would be a “capstone” or “project” that would be completed during the second year. **Share this within Divisions to assess interest for year one and year two.** Be mindful that institutional expense would require that these activities be beneficial for both the individual and the institution.

- Natalie Holman – LC vision statement information

Ad hoc committee charged to review the LCSC vision statement as the current one didn't feel as if it was pertinent to our current culture. Asking faculty to give two to three phrases to describe college aspirations to communicate that LCSC should be the college of choice. **Meeting will occur Wednesday after Spring Break, so seek faculty feedback by that time.**

Provost Stinson reminded Senate that Students, CSO, PSO, and Faculty on this committee will develop a starting point which will then be taken to campus conversations before finalization.

V. Division Updates

SS: Meeting this week, holding comments until Merit discussion.

Business: 29th Annual Grape and Grain will occur April 19th.

Teacher Ed: two events this week of note.

1. Panels of professional to speak to students about issues within the profession.
2. Lewiston independent foundation for education recognized the top teacher within the district and teacher of the year awards. Two awards were given to LCSC alumni.

ASLCS: Election season starts April 3 and 4th, and elections are April 17 and 18th.

Encourage students to vote! Legacy project is to purchase a digital display reader board to be placed on the SUB to announce upcoming events.

Student Services: Midterms= conversations on stress management. New advising model, so STARs are happening earlier than previously.

Library: Busy with research paper/assignment appointments.

T&I: April 3-5th skills USA for the state of Idaho. Division is sending people to Boise/Nampa area. Not usually open to public but HVAC competition on campus is April 4th. Hands on activities 0915 to 1145 vs. students from NIC to send students to nationals.

BTS: Joanie Mina is retiring, two applicants on campus after spring break. See Facebook as the Hospitality program had a “chopped” competition recently.

NHS: Admissions for BSN done, Radiography applicant process going on now.

DONSAM: Search for new chair still in progress. Hosting a conference over spring break for NW Science Association, where faculty will present. An award is being given to Professor William Lavell. Matt Brady is the conference chair and the website will have information.

MASS: *Rock the Walk* is a campus wide event where faculty/staff can create teams to encourage activity by step count weekly for the Month of April. A team to Florida to co-present and hosting a leadership conference for students April 18-19th.

Humanities: Two candidates to campus: Seth Bradshaw and Josh Gatar.

VI. Standing Committee Reports

- a. Budget, Planning and Assessment: Jenni Light – chair, no report
- b. Curriculum: Lauran Nichols – chair: No report
- c. Faculty Affairs: Leif Hoffmann – chair/Jenni Light - Merit ranking job evaluation conversation – please solicit feedback from your divisions – email feedback to Leif lshoffmann@lcsc.edu

Thanks to all who submitted applications for faculty development grants, letters are in the mail and thanks to Provost for the money. Pay close attention to the applications and speak with Division representative before submitting.

Issue was brought up in regard to faculty evaluations and ranking as this is the second year with four tier system. Concerns were brought up at the meeting, next meeting will be Monday after Spring Break. Any additional concerns need to be forwarded ASAP to Leif Hoffmann or Division reps.

1. Morale
2. Pay

The Faculty Affairs committee has listed the following concerns and recommendations:

Concerns:

- Rankings appear to faculty be too subjectively applied within and across divisions
- Some contributions appear not to be fairly included in evaluations
- Particular concern is the apparent inconsistent application of what constitutes a “4” from different units
- No rubric or metric for what determines a “4” (or the other categories)
- Big jump between categories “3” and “4”
- Issue of professional acclamation; faculty wants to be recognized for what they do; the category “meet” feels like a minimum; given that faculty doesn’t get paid much, faculty feels that this seriously hurts morale / is a slap in the face when somebody has done more than the “minimum”, but is only in category “3”
- It is unclear when rankings are made whether they are based on a comparison with one’s own job description or with other faculty colleagues within a specialty area/division/across campus; there appears to be different practices across campus/no clarity; this raises the question, especially when one is compared to one’s own job description, of creating a very minimal job description at the beginning of the year to demonstrate more strongly all the extra things one has done by the end of the year to be moved from 3 to a 4 category
- Issue of pay:
 - in original discussions, the talk was that there will not be base pay increase but only a bonus for those earning the highest ranking in a given year;
 - faculty is concerned that while in some years a person gets a “4” there will be significant pay increase (due to state legislature/governor’s office advocating for a 2/3/4 percent increase) while in another year a person might receive a “4” and there is no pay increase authorized by the state

Recommendations/Suggestions:

- Given that originally the message was that the top ranking was not tied to base pay raises, but to bonuses, is it possible to limit merit base pay raise to rankings one to three, with categories “3” and “4” receiving the same base salary increase in any giving year, but where “4” would also receive a bonus on top of the base salary?
- Change the wording for category “3” from “meets” to “meets or exceeds expectations”; with the category “4” being “substantially exceeds”
- Develop a clear description and/or rubric/guidelines for the four categories. The committee thinks that it would be worthwhile to a) create an universal language/description for the categories cross-campus and b) allow the individual

- divisions, if desired/needed, to develop any additional clarification/rubric in regards to the four categories
- Ensure that there is more conversations/exchanges between division chairs regarding “uniformity” of assessment of faculty
 - Need to develop / provide more clarity and uniformity in regards to job descriptions

An additional point discussed was to consider moving to a 5-tier ranking system.

Provost: Point of clarification that the Provost does not have anything in this process.

Evaluations are done by Division Chairs and Dean.

A pay “bonus” was not an option last semester since faculty would have gotten less than professional staff with the ranking. Bonuses are being discussed, but are not an option currently, so Provost Stinson has asked VP of finance to discuss this with faculty. Added the reminder that when the current evaluation system was created it was not a top down thing other than changing from two rankings, but rather Faculty Affairs updated the current policy, with faculty feedback. Provost Stinson recommends using rubrics within divisions to assess faculty.

Next steps: this is a recommendation to administration and chairs and Deans need to be included. The policy needs to be evaluated and a proposal made. Administration is open to proposals, since this was a faculty driven policy when it was originally made. Two pieces are policy and pay, not together. Discomfort is widely known.

Divisions weighed in on feedback. Top ranking was used sparingly was the idea, but there was no directive on how many. Discussions on wording and on how the evaluation is addressed. One of the issues is that staff were ranked higher on the tier as a percentage (for example 40% of them got a 4 and 5% of faculty got 4). Jenni provided this information to the Provost so this issue has been addressed. It was suggested to work together with CSO and PSO.

Please have faculty give information to Faculty affairs....circulate the comments since it will be discussed April 1st. This memo is on the webpage.

We do have time to work on this since we are done for this “year” and anything we do will affect the next year’s evaluations.

- d. General Education: Brett Morris – chair: No report
- e. Student Affairs: Amanda VanLanen – chair
- f. President’s Council – Jenni

VII. Good of the Order

End of April: Art Under the Elms April 26-28rd. Food drive the week before. Volunteers needed.

Faculty Staff Awards event April 5th, please RSVP for food count.

Motion to adjourn by Jennifer Weeks, seconded by Lynne Bidwell, approved unanimously.